

The Classical Review

JUNE 1894.

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE FIRST BOOK OF THE *STROMATEIS* OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE present unhappy condition of the text of Clement has often been deplored by scholars. The particular treatise with which I am here concerned depends upon a single corrupt MS. of the eleventh century, and little has been done for it since Potter's edition of 1715, the last two editors having contributed next to nothing to clear it of the innumerable errors by which it is disfigured. Klotz indeed would seem never to have corrected his proofs, leaving continual mistakes of spelling and actually omitting several words between the end of one line and the beginning of another, while even Dindorf's text is in many respects inferior to what might easily have been constructed out of the text and notes of Potter's edition. The growing interest which has been taken in the writings of Clement among English scholars of late years encourages the hope that a serious effort may shortly be made to remove this reproach on our modern scholarship, and provide a worthier edition of an author who is on many grounds so important. As examples of this interest I may refer to the excellent emendations by Prof. Bywater which appeared in the *Journal of Philology* as long ago as 1870, to the paper which has been lately read by Dr. Henry Jackson before the Cambridge Philological Society, and to the edition of the *Quis Dives Salvetur* promised in the Cambridge 'Texts and Studies.' As a small contribution to such an edition I venture to send to the editor of the *Classical Review* a transcript

NO. LXX. VOL. VIII.

of notes on the First Book of the *Stromateis* which I have made on the margin of my copy of Clement. The notes on the succeeding books may follow if space can be found for them. Some of the emendations are, I think, tolerably certain; others are of a tentative nature, and are inserted here rather by way of calling out happier conjectures from other scholars, than as claiming to be final solutions of the difficulties of the text. Unless otherwise stated the text commented on is Dindorf's. It may be helpful to readers who are not familiar with Clement's writings, if I repeat here the words with which Prof. Bywater prefaces his emendations (*Jour. of Phil.* iv. 204)—'the main difficulties connected with the critical study of Clement arise from three sources: (1) besides the recognized palaeographical causes of corruption, the text seems to have suffered from the transposition and repetition of words occurring in lines immediately above or below that on which the copyist was engaged; (2) words and sometimes whole lines have dropped out; (3) the Codex Laurentianus, which is our sole authority for the *Stromateis*, must be the descendant of a MS. which frequently exhibited words in a mutilated form through contraction and possibly also through injury similar to that sustained by the Bodleian Plato, where the ends of the lines are frequently illegible through damp.'

§ 4, p. 318. ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν κηρυκὴ ἐπιστήμη,
ἡ δ' ἐπὶ πῶς ἀγγελικὴ, ὅποτέρως ἂν ἐνεργῇ, διὰ
S

τε τῆς χειρὸς διὰ τε τῆς γλώττης ὠφελοῦσα. Clement is not here distinguishing between an apostolic and an angelic knowledge, but upholding the right to write as well as to preach in behalf of the Gospel. Both speakers and writers are ἀποδεκτοί, as it is said just above; both εἰς οὐρανὸν περὶνται, as we read below; both deserve the title of θεοῦ διάκονοι (as in 2 Cor. vi. 4 quoted just afterwards), being sent forth to minister for those who shall be heirs of salvation; both may therefore be denoted by the word ἄγγελος, used in Rev. i. 20 of the representatives of the Seven Churches. Remove the comma after ἐπιστήμη and read ἀλλὰ μὴ ἡ... ᾗδε, translating 'this science of the preacher is in a way angelical, whether the hand or the tongue be called into action.'

§ 7, p. 319. ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν ἀπολλυμένην βρῶσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. τροφήν δὲ καὶ ἡ διὰ σιτίων καὶ ἡ διὰ λόγων λαμβάνεται. Omit the articles in the last sentence, or else read λαμβανομένη.

§ 8, p. 320. ὃ δ' ἂν ἐκ πίστεως ἔλθαι τις ἐστιᾷσαι, βέβαιος οὗτος εἰς θεῶν λόγων παραδοχὴν, κρίσιν εὐλογον τὴν πίστιν κεκτημένος. Here it is the faith of the hearer, not of the speaker, which is spoken of, and the demonstrative in the apodosis should answer to the relative in the protasis. Read ὅστις δ' ἂν ἐκ πίστεως ἔλθαι ἐστιᾷσθαι.

§ 9, p. 320. τὴν πέτραν, τὴν πατομένην ὁδὸν, [τὴν καρποφόρον γῆν] τὴν ὑλομανοῦσαν χώραν, τὴν εὐφορον καὶ καλὴν καὶ γεωργουμένην, τὴν πολυπλασιᾶσαι τὸν σπόρον δυναμένην. It is evident that the last two clauses refer, not to the thorny ground, but the fruit-bearing ground, τὴν καρποφόρον γῆν, which should be placed after χώραν.

§ 10, p. 321. Πλάτων κελεύει τοὺς γεωργοὺς... μὴ λαμβάνειν ὕδωρ παρ' ἐτέρων ἢ μὴ πρότερον ὀρύξαντες παρ' αὐτῶν... ἀνδρὸν εὐρωσι τὴν γῆν. Read αὐτοῖς for αὐτῶν which is merely a corruption from the preceding ἐτέρων. Immediately below we have ἀπορία γὰρ ἐπαρκεῖν δίκαιον, ἀργίαν δὲ ἐφοδιάζειν οὐ καλὸν, εἰ καὶ φορτίον συνεπιτιθέναι μὲν εὐλογον, συγκαθαίρειν δὲ οὐ προσήκειν ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἔλεγεν. For εἰ καὶ read εἰ γε.

§ 11, p. 322. Describing his teachers Clement says ὁ μὲν τις τῶν Ἀσσυρίων, ὁ δὲ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Ἑβραῖος ἀνέκαθεν, ἑσάτῳ δὲ περὶ τυχῶν [δυναμίει δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος ἦν] ἀνεπαναστάμην, ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θηράσας λεληθότα, Σικελικῇ τῷ ὄντι ἡ μέλιττα, προφητικῶς τε καὶ ἀποστολικῶς λειμῶνος τὰ ἄνθη δρεπόμενος... ἐνεγέννησε κ.τ.λ. Transfer the words in brackets to begin a new sentence after λεληθότα, and omit ἡ before μέλιττα.

§ 13, p. 323. ἡ καὶ οὐ κεκώλυκεν ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ ἀγαθοῦ σαββατίζειν μεταδίδοναι δὲ τῶν θεῶν μυστηρίων... συγκεχώρηκεν. It makes nonsense to say 'The Lord has not hindered us from resting from good.' The word should be κεκέλευκεν 'he has not commanded us to rest from doing good, but has permitted us to impart the divine mysteries.'

§ 14, p. 324. ἐπαγγέλλεται... τοῦ ὑπομνήσαι εἴτε ποτὲ ἐκλαθόμεθα εἴτε ὅπως μὴδ' ἐκλαθάνοιμεθα. Read ἐκλαθάνοιμεθα.

Ib. ἔστι μὲν οὖν τινα μὴδὲ ἀπομνημονεῖν θέντα ἡμῖν, πολλὴ γὰρ ἡ παρὰ τοῖς μακαρίοις δύναμις ἢν ἀνδράσιν, ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀνποσημείωτα μεμενηκότα τῷ χρόνῳ νῦν ἀπέδρα, τὰ δὲ ὅσα ἐσβένντο ἐν αὐτῇ ματαιούμενα τῇ διανοίᾳ [ἐπεὶ μὴ ῥάδιος ἡ τοιαύτη διακονία τοῖς μὴ δεδοκιμασμένοις], ταῦτα δὲ ἀναζωπυρῶν ὑπομνημασι τὰ μὲν ἐκὼν παρατίμωμαι ἐκλέγων ἐπισταμένους. Clement is here distinguishing between three portions of the instructions he received. One portion is entirely forgotten, 'for great was the power of those teachers'; another portion was not recorded at the time and has now slipped his memory; the remaining portion was beginning to fade away, but he hopes to revive his reminiscences by writing down what he can still remember. The reason for the loss of the first portion is hardly intelligible. I should suggest μὴδὲ ἀπομνημονεῖν θέναι δινηθέντα: the wisdom of the speakers transcended the capacity of the hearer. The clause in brackets would perhaps come better at the end giving a reason for ἐκλέγων ἐπισταμένους. A little below Clement says he is afraid to impart all that he heard to his readers, μὴ πῃ ἐτέρως σφαλῇ. Here I think we should insert λαβόντες or some such word, 'lest taking it in the wrong way they should fall.'

§ 15, p. 325. (ἡ ἐποπτικὴ θεωρία) προβήσεται ἡμῖν κατὰ τὸν... τῆς παραδόσεως κανόνα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως προϋοῦσιν ἀναγκαίως ἔχοντα προδιαληφθῆναι τῆς φυσικῆς θεωρίας προπαρατιθέμενη καὶ τὰ ἐμποδὼν ἱστάμενα τῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ προαπολυμένη. Put a comma after προϋοῦσιν and insert τὰ before ἀναγκαίως corresponding to the τὰ before ἐμποδῶν.

§ 17, p. 326. οὐχ ὁμοίως θεωρεῖ τὸ πρόβατον ὁ μάγειρός τε καὶ ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰ πῶν ἔστι πολυπραγμονεῖ, ὁ δὲ εἰ εὐγένειαν τηρεῖ. The MS. has εἰς εὐγένειαν, which Potter changed to εἰ εὐγένειον an *densum habeat vellus observat*. I see no reason for altering the MS. reading, which I should translate 'looks after the sheep with a view to the goodness of the breed.'

§ 18, p. 326. οἱ δὲ καὶ πρὸς κακοῦ ἂν τὴν

φιλοσοφίαν εἰσδεδυνέαι τὸν βίον νομίζουσιν. Omit *ἀν*, which may perhaps have arisen from a marginal correction of *καὶ* into *κἄν*.

§ 20, p. 327. πρὸς τὸ μήτε αὐτὴν φιλοσοφίαν λυμᾶναι τὸν βίον [ψευδῶν πραγμάτων καὶ φαύλων ἔργων δημιουργὸν ὑπάρχουσιν, ἣν τινας διαβεβλήκασιν] ἀληθείας οὖσαν εἰκόνα ἐναργῆ, θείαν δωρεάν Ἑλλήσι δεδομένην, μήτε ἡμᾶς ἀποσπᾶσθαι τῆς πίστεως. Omit the words which I have bracketed, and insert (after *δεδομένην*) ἣν τινας διαβεβλήκασιν, <ὥς δὴ> ψευδῶν πραγμάτων—ὑπάρχουσιν. Just below insert the article before *συναφή*.

§ 21, p. 327. Here again I think Dindorf has wrongly altered the MS. reading. He gives after Heinsius τὰληθῆς γλῦκὺ τι φαίνεται ζητηθὲν καὶ πῶν πορισθὲν, where the MS. has γλῦκῦτητι. The latter seems to me to correspond better with the following dative, as well as with the preceding ὁ τῆς ἀγρᾶς ἐρωτικός.

§ 22, p. 328. (οἱ σοφισταὶ) κνήθοντες καὶ γαργαλίζοντες οὐκ ἀνδρικῶς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, τὰς ἀκοῦς τῶν κνίσσασθαι γλιχομένων, ποταμὸς ἀτέχνων ῥημάτων νοῦ δὲ σταλαγμός. For κνίσσασθαι read either κνίζεσθαι or κνήθεσθαι, for ἀτέχνων (which is quite inappropriate in reference to the sophists, who are in the preceding sentence stigmatized as ζῆλωται τεχνυδρίων, and ἐπαυρόμενοι τῇ τέχνῃ) read ἀτεχνῶς, a favourite word with Clement and one which is naturally used to introduce a proverb. [I find that I have been anticipated in reading ἀτεχνῶς by Bywater and Cobet.]

§ 28, p. 331. ὅτι ὁ ποῦς σου, φησὶν, οὐ μὴ προσκόψῃ, ἐπὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν τὰ καλὰ ἀναφέροντος. There is probably a lacuna of some lines before *ὅτι*, and we should perhaps read ἀναφέρων to agree with the subject of *φησὶ*. In the last line of the section read with Petavius πολιτείας for πολυτελείας.

§ 32, p. 335. κατ' ἄλλους μέντοι γε τόπους ἐξεταζόμεναι αἱ προειρημέναι γραφαὶ ἄλλα μυστήρια μνηνόνσι παρεστάναι. For the unsuitable τόπους Potter proposed τύπους. I should suggest τρόπους.

§ 33, p. 335. τροφή γὰρ καὶ ἡ παιδευσίς ἡ χρηστὴ σωζομένη φύσει ἀγαθὰ ποιεῖ. Put καὶ after παιδευσίς and omit the following article, τροφή γὰρ ἡ παιδευσίς, καὶ χρηστὴ κ.τ.λ. [unless, as Dr. Jackson suggests to me, we simply restore the original in Plat. *Rep.* iv. 424 A by omitting the articles].

§ 34, p. 336. εἰ δὲ ἐν τῷ ταμείῳ εὖ χῃ, ὥς ὁ Κύριος ἐδίδαξε πνεύματι προσκυνεῖν, οὐκέτι περὶ τὸν οἶκον εἴη ἂν μόνῃ ἡ οἰκονομία, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὴν ψυχὴν. Insert ἡ after εἰ δὲ and read εὖχῃ for εὖχῃ and μόνον for μόνῃ, translating

'if the prayer in the closet is, as the Lord taught, to pray in spirit, housekeeping would no longer be occupied with the house alone, but with the soul also.'

§ 36, p. 337. ὅσοι δὲ καὶ θεοῦ ῥῆσιν αἰδούνουσιν, ἥνπερ πεπνυμένα αἰδῶσιν, οὐ τιθέμενοι ἐν σοφίῃ, γνώμην δ' ἔχουσι μωρίας. So Dindorf after Bernays, who however proposes either to omit δ' or to read δέχονται. I should prefer to put δ' after τιθέμενοι, translating 'though they should sing well, yet not using it (the divine word) wisely, they are thought fools.'

§ 37, p. 337. φύεται τε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν μνημάτων σκῆ καὶ εἰ τι τῶν ἀναιδεστέρων δένδρων καὶ τὰ φνόμενα ἐν τύπῳ προκύπτει τῶν ἀληθῶν, ὅτι τῆς αὐτῆς τοῦ ἕτοιμοῦ ἀπέλαυσε δυνάμει, ἀλλ' οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐσχῆκε χάριν τοῖς ἐν τῷ πόνῳ φύεισιν. For τύπῳ read τοιοῦτῳ τότῳ and for ἀληθῶν read ἄλλων.

§ 37, p. 338. οὐχ ἡ ποιμενικὴ μόνῃ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ βουκολικὴ, ἱπποτροφικὴ τε καὶ κινστροφικὴ καὶ μελισσοργικὴ τέχναι πᾶσαι, συνελόντι δ' εἰπεῖν, ἀγελοκομικὴ τε καὶ ζωοτροφικὴ καὶ ἀλλήλων μὲν τῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἥττον διαφέρουσι, πλὴν αἱ πᾶσαι βιωφελεῖς. Transfer the phrases ἀγελοκομικὴ τε καὶ ζωοτροφικὴ and τέχναι πᾶσαι.

§ 38. εἰ ποτε οἱ μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι διαβιοῦσι καλῶς εὖ ποιεῖν, εὐποιῶ γὰρ περιπεπτώκασιν, ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ εὐστοχοῦσι διὰ συνέσεως εἰς τὸν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον. Omit εὖ ποιεῖν as having arisen from dittography, and insert φασὶν after περιπεπτώκασιν, translating 'if it be true that men without knowledge live a good life, "for (say they) they have stumbled on a right way of action," so too some through their natural ability are fortunate in regard to the word concerning the truth.'

§ 39, p. 339. αἱ τοῖνυν τέχναι εἰ μὴ μετὰ φιλοσοφίας γίνονται, βλαβερώτεροι παντὶ πονεῖν ἂν. After τέχναι read αἶδε ἐὰν μὴ.

§ 43, p. 341. ἄμπελος δὲ ὁ Κύριος ἀλληγορεῖται, παρ' οὗ... τὸν καρπὸν τρυγητέον, κλαδεῖσαι δεῖ. Here we should put a full stop after τρυγητέον, and perhaps insert δεῖ before δεῖ.

§ 43, p. 342. παρορᾶται δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀθλητής, ὥς προεῖρηται, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν σύνταξιν συμβαλλόμενος. This sentence follows an argument proving the importance of knowledge for success in all pursuits. It is unmeaning as it stands, and unless my memory deceives me there has been no previous mention of the athlete. Possibly προεῖρηται may be a repetition of παρορᾶται. We might complete the sense by reading (after ἀθλητής) ὃς νεῦρα μόνον καὶ σάρκας

παρέχει, μηδὲν ἄλλο εἰς τὴν σύνταξιν συμβαλλόμενος.

§ 44, p. 342. πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶδεν ἄσπεα. Restore the Homeric ἴδεν, changed by itacism. Just below πολυΰπειρος οὔτος τῆς ἀληθείας ἰχνευτῆς...δίκην τῆς βασιάνου λίθου [ἡ δ' ἐστὶ Ἀνδρὶ διακρίνειν πεπιστευμένη τὸ νόθον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰθαγενεοῦς χρυσίου] καὶ ἱκανὸς ὦν χωρίζειν...σοφιστικὴν μὲν φιλοσόφον, κομμητικὴν δὲ γυμναστικὴν. The clause in brackets is I think a gloss. Omit καὶ before ἱκανὸς and read φιλοσοφίας for φιλοσόφον.

§ 45, p. 343. ἐργάζεται δὲ καὶ τὰ κτήνη ἐλαυνόμενα ἀναγκάζοντι τῷ φόβῳ. οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ ὀρθοδόξασται καλούμενοι ἐργοῖς προσφέρονται καλοῖς, οὐκ εἰδότες ἃ ποιοῦσιν. These words seem inconsistent with the previous argument and with what follows, showing the necessity of reason for action. Probably they belong to the opponent's argument and have been wrongly inserted here.

§ 45, p. 343. τὰς δὲ ἐντολὰς ἀπογράψαι δισσῶς βουλήσκει καὶ γνώσει τοῦ ἀποκρίνασθαι λόγους ἀληθείας τοῖς προβαλλομένοις σοι. τίς οὖν ἡ γνώσις τοῦ ἀποκρίνασθαι ἢ τίς καὶ τοῦ ἐρωτᾶν; εἴη δ' ἂν αὕτη διαλεκτική. Read ἀποκρίνασθαι; ἀρ' ἦ τις καὶ τοῦ ἐρωτᾶν;

§ 46, p. 343. ἡ γὰρ διαβολὴ ξίφους διάκονος καὶ λύπην ἐμποιεῖ βλασφημία, ἐξ ὧν αἱ τοῦ βίου ἀνατροπαί, ἔργα τοῦ ποιηροῦ λόγον εἶεν ἂν ταῦτα. Insert καὶ after ἀνατροπαί.

§ 47, p. 343. αἱ λέξεις αὗται τῶν σοφιστῶν οὐ μόνον γοητεύουσιν, κλέπτουσι τοὺς πολλοὺς, βιαζόμεναι δὲ ἐστ' ὅτε Καδμεῖαν νίκην ἀπενέγκαντο. Sylburg's first thought was to read γοητεύονται, but he persuaded himself (and Dindorf) that parallels for the asyndeton might be found. I do not think those which they adduce are sufficient to justify it, and the participle is demanded by the following βιαζόμεναι. [Dr. Jackson reminds me that in *Plat. Rep.* iv. 413, as also in *Strom.* i. § 42, men are said to lose the truth ἢ κλαπέντες ἢ γοητευθέντες ἢ βιασθέντες. It seems better therefore to read here γοητεύουσι καί.]

§ 52, p. 347. πολιτεύεσθαι εἰς δύναμιν ἐξομοιωτικὴν τῷ θεῷ διδάσκει καὶ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ὡς ἡγεμονικὸν πάσης προΐεσθαι παιδείας. Read ἐξομοιωτικὸν ('to live to the best of our power in imitation of God'). For προΐεσθαι read προσΐεσθαι and for οἰκονομίαν perhaps οἰκοδομήν 'to accept edification as the guiding principle of all education.'

§ 56, p. 348. ἀλλ' ὁ ἀκούετε εἰς τὸ οὖς, φησὶν ὁ Κύριος, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων, τὰς ἀποκρίφους τῆς ἀληθοῦς γνώσεως παραδόσεις [ἐνὶ ἡλώϊς καὶ ἐξόχως ἐρμηνευόμενας] ἐκδέχεσθαι κελεῖων, καὶ καθάπερ ἠκούσαμεν εἰς τὸ οὖς, οὕτω καὶ παραδίδόναι εἰς δέον. Transfer the

phrase in brackets to the end. It is an allegorical interpretation of ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων.

Ib. ἀλλ' ἐστὶ τῷ ὄντι ἡ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ὑποτύπωσις ὅσα διασποράδην καὶ διερριμμένως ἐγκατεσπαρμένην ἔχουσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ὅπως ἂν λάθοι τοὺς δίκην κολοῖων σπερμολόγους. For ἔχουσι read ἔχονσα and omit ὅσα. One might be inclined to suggest ἂν λάθῃ, but in § 42 we find ὅς ἂν μοι βέλτιστος φαίνοιτο.

§ 57, p. 349. οἱ μὲν οὐκ ὀλίγα, οἱ δὲ μέρος τι εἶπερ ἄρα τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας λόγου ἔχοντες ἀναδειχθεῖεν. Place a comma before and after εἶπερ ἄρα, and insert ἂν before ἀναδειχθεῖεν.

Ib. (The partial truths of opposing heresies are seen to be in harmony when viewed in relation to the whole, thus) ἐν ἀριθμοῖς ὁ ἄρτιος τῷ περιττῷ διαφέρεται, ὁμολογοῦσι δὲ ἅμφω τῇ ἀριθμητικῇ ὡς τῷ σχήματι ὁ κύκλος καὶ τὸ τρίγωνον καὶ τὸ τετράγωνον καὶ ὅσα τῶν σχημάτων ἀλλήλων διενήνοχεν. Here I should read τῷ ἀριθμητικῷ with a comma following, and change σχήματι into μαθηματικῷ. The latter corruption is easily explained if we suppose the first three and the last two letters of [μαθ]ηματ[ικῷ] to have become illegible. Translate 'in arithmetic the odd and even numbers are incongruous, but are both reduced to harmony by the arithmetician, just as the circle and triangle and square and all other incongruous figures are harmonious to the mathematician.'

§ 59, p. 350. I cannot agree with Dindorf in regarding as probable Valckenaer's suggestion that the dozen lines beginning ὃν Ἑλληνικὸν οἶδε προφήτην, οὐ μὲννηται ὁ ἀπόστολος ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τίτον ἐπιστολῇ are the note of a scholiast. Perhaps οὐ μὲννηται may be a gloss on οἶδε. Just below in ὁρᾷς ὅπως καὶ ἂν τοῖς Ἑλλήνων προφήταις δίδωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, I think we should read καί, the dative being governed by δίδωσι.

§ 59, p. 350. πρὸς γοῦν Κορινθίους, οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα μόνον, περὶ τῆς τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως διαλεγόμενος ἱαμβεῖω συγκέχρηται τραγικῷ, τί μοι ὄφελος; λέγων, οἱ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται. In the preceding sentence Clement had quoted Tit. i. 12 as showing St. Paul's acquaintance with Greek poetry. It seems to me that the more natural order in this sentence would be οὐ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα μόνον ἱαμβεῖω συγκέχρηται τραγικῷ πρὸς γοῦν Κορινθίους, περὶ τῆς τῶν νεκρῶν ἀναστάσεως διαλεγόμενος, τί μοι ὄφελος, λέγει, εἰ οἱ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται; The indicative λέγει would naturally be altered to λέγων when the order of the words was lost.

§ 60, p. 351. Πλάτων πάλα τὸ διὰ σπουδῆς γεγονέναι τόνδε τὸν τρόπον λέγει. Omit τό.

§ 67, p. 355. ἐπαίνων Πιλάτων τοὺς βαρβάρους ὡς διαφερόντως ἀσκήσαντας μόνους ἀληθῶς φησὶ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοχοῦ καὶ ἐν Ἑλληνιστῇ καὶ βαρβάρους, ὧν καὶ ἱερὰ πολλὰ ἤδη γέγονε διὰ τοὺς τοιοῦτους παῖδας. The sentence is evidently incomplete, wanting an object for ἀσκήσαντας and an explanation for τοιοῦτους παῖδας. We are helped to supply what is wanting by a comparison of the passage referred to (*Symp.* 209) in which Diotima describes the action of Eros Philosopher, who seeks immortality by begetting, not human children, but true and beautiful thoughts, εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀποβλέψας καὶ Ἡσίοδον... ζηλῶν, οἷα ἔκγονα ἐάντων ἀπολείπουσιν, ... τίμιος δὲ παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ Σόλων διὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων γέννησιν καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλοι πολλοχοῦ ἄνδρες καὶ ἐν Ἑλληνιστῇ καὶ ἐν βαρβάρους... ὧν καὶ ἱερὰ πολλὰ ἤδη γέγονε διὰ τοὺς τοιοῦτους παῖδας, and again by the phrase in 212 B καὶ αὐτὸς τιμῶ τὰ ἐρωτικά καὶ διαφερόντως ἀσκήσας. I think however that Clement was more likely to take as the object of ἀσκήσαντας an ordinary word like φιλοσοφία, which he has used several times just before, than the less intelligible ἐρωτικά; and a general word, such as γράμματα, is more suitable than ποιήματα or νόμους, which would apply only to a particular case. I should propose therefore to read ἀσκήσαντας <τὴν φιλοσοφίαν>, μόνους ἀληθῶς φησὶν <ἔκγονα ἐάντων καταλείπειν τοὺς φιλοσόφους τὰ γράμματα> καὶ ἄλλοι κ.τ.λ.

§ 70, p. 358. Ἡράκλειτος γὰρ οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνως φησὶν, ἀλλὰ σὺν θεῷ μάλλον Σίβυλλη πεφάνθαι. This is the MS. reading which Dindorf, following Hervetus, alters by reading Σίβυλλαν. The reference to the famous words describing the prophetic power of the Sibyl, Σίβυλλα μαινομένη στόματι ἀγέλαστα καὶ ἀκαλλόπιστα καὶ ἀμέριστα φθεγγομένη χιλίων ἐτῶν ἐξικνέται τῇ φωνῇ διὰ τὸν θεόν, will be made plain if we alter the meaningless μάλλον into τὸ μέλλον.

§ 71, p. 359. προσέτησαν (φιλοσοφίας) Αἰγυπτίῳ τε οἱ προφῆται... καὶ Περσῶν οἱ μάγοι οἱ μὲν γὰρ καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος προεμήνυσαν τὴν γένεσιν... Ἰνδῶν τε οἱ γυμνοσοφισταὶ, ἄλλοι τε. Here we have a list of barbarian philosophers, among them the Magi. After οἱ μάγοι read οἱ καὶ τοῦ σωτήρος, omitting μὲν γὰρ, which may be merely a dittography of μάγοι.

§ 80, p. 366. Ἀντίλοχος... ἀπὸ τῆς Πυθαγόρου ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐπικουρίου τελευτήν, γαμηλιῶνος δὲ δεκάτῃ ἱσταμένον γενομένην ἔτη φέροι τὰ πάντα τριακόσια δώδεκα. Omit δὲ as caused by dittography of the following syllable. Similar examples may be found in § 48, p. 345 where μὴ is inserted from the

following μετὰ, § 54, p. 347 *fin.* where οὐ has been foisted in from the preceding θεοῦ, iii. § 4, p. 511 ἡμεῖς εὐνουχίαν μὲν... μακαρίζομεν, μονογαμίαν δὲ... θαναμάζομεν, συμπάσχειν δὲ εἰ δὲν λέγοντες καὶ ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαστάζωμεν, where the second δὲ is owing to the following εἰ δὲν, § 6, 512 ἥλιος κοινὰς τροφὰς ζώους ἅπασιν ἀνατέλλει δικαιοσύνης τε τῆς κοινῆς ἅπασιν ἐπ' ἰσῆς δοθείσης, where τε should be omitted on the same ground.

§ 81, p. 366. καὶ φασὶν γεγράφθαι, πάντες οἱ πρὸ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ Κυρίου κλέπται εἰσὶ καὶ λησταί. πάντες μὲν οὖν οἱ ἐν λόγῳ—οὗτοι δὲ οἱ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ λόγου σαρκώσεως—ἐξακούμενοι καὶ καθολικώτερον. Read ἄνευ λόγου for ἐν λόγῳ, δὲ for δὴ, and ἐξελέγχονται for ἐξακούμενοι, 'All who spoke without the teaching of the Word—and these are they who lived before the Incarnation of the Word—are convicted in general terms.'

§ 83, p. 367. (Speaking of the burning of the Grecian fleet as caused by the inaction of Achilles) ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν διὰ μῆνιν—ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ἦν καὶ μῆνιν καὶ μὴ—καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἀπέριγε τὸ πῦρ, καὶ ἰσως συναίτιος, ὁ δὲ διάβολος αὐτεξούσιος ὧν καὶ μετανοῆσαι οἷός τε ἦν καὶ κλέψαι, καὶ ὁ αἴτιος αὐτὸς τῆς κλοπῆς. It seems necessary to insert οὐκ before the first ἦν in order to mark the contrast between the accessory and the sole cause. There would have been no reason for referring to the wrath of Achilles, unless it were intended to oppose it to the αὐτεξουσία of Satan. καὶ μὴν should be omitted as a dittography of the preceding words.

§ 90, p. 371. ἀγαθὸν δ' ἂν ἀνάγκη θεοῦ ἀγαθὸν τὸν λόγον. For ἂν read εἶναι.

§ 91, p. 372. Clement is never very exact in his quotations, but the inaccuracies in his report of St. Paul's sermon at Athens seem to pass the bounds of possibility. Dindorf, however, who goes out of his way to change προστεταγμένους (which is the reading of the best MSS. in Acts xvii. 26) into προτεταγμένους, has no scruple in printing ζητεῖν τὸ θεῖον εἰ ἄρα ψηλαφήσειαν ἢ εὐροῖεν ἂν, καίτοι οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντος, where the original has τὸν θεόν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὐροῖεν, καὶ γε... ὑπάρχοντα. Here τὸ θεῖον and the omission of αὐτὸν and of γε after ἄρα and the change of καὶ γε into καίτοι are quite in Clement's style, and ἢ for καὶ, though it spoils the sense, is found in some of the MSS. of the G.T., but ἂν is merely a dittography of the preceding syllable and ὑπάρχοντος is a scribe's corruption to suit the preceding genitive.

§ 92, p. 372. (We accept that philosophy) περὶ ἧς... λέγει Σωκράτης· εἰσὶ γὰρ δὴ, ὡς

φασιν, περὶ τὰς τελετὰς νάρθηκοφόροι μὲν πολλοί, βάχκοι δὲ τε παῖροι, πολλοὺς μὲν τοὺς κλητοὺς, ὀλίγους δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αἰνιττόμενος. The text of *Phaedo* 69 has φασὶν οἱ περὶ τὰς τελετὰς, but Clement wrote φησὶ, as we may judge from the following αἰνιττόμενος.

§ 94, p. 373. εἴτ' οὖν κατὰ περίπτωσιν φασιν ἀποφθέγγασθαι τινα τῆς ἀληθοῦς φιλοσοφίας τοὺς Ἕλληνας θείας οἰκονομίας ἢ περίπτωσις... εἴτε κατὰ συντυχίαν οὐκ ἀπροϊόητος ἢ συντυχία, εἴτ' αὖ φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν ἐσχηκέναι τοὺς Ἕλληνας λέγει τὸν τῆς φύσεως δημιουργὸν ἕνα γινώσκοντες, καθὺ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην φυσικὴν εἰρήκαμεν, εἴτε μὴν κοινὸν ἐσχηκέναι νοῦν τίς ὁ πατήρ καὶ τίς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ νοῦ διανομὴν σκοπήσωμεν. The first thing here is to improve the punctuation, which is throughout most unintelligent in Dindorf's edition, by placing a comma between Ἕλληνας and θείας, and again after συντυχίαν, and λέγει, and νοῦν, and a full stop after συντυχία. Then insert τις between λέγει and τὸν, and for ἕνα γινώσκοντες read ἐννοία φυσικῇ (which has dropped into the line below in the shape of φυσικὴν) γινώσκοντες (or perhaps better γινώσκασθαι or γινώσκόμενον). The second sentence will then stand thus: εἴτ' αὖ φυσικὴν ἔννοιαν ἐσχηκέναι τοὺς Ἕλληνας λέγει τις, τὸν τῆς φύσεως δημιουργὸν ἐννοία φυσικῇ γινώσκοντες, καθὺ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην εἰρήκαμεν, εἴτε μὴν κοινὸν ἐσχηκέναι νοῦν, τίς ὁ τοῦτον πατήρ...σκοπήσωμεν, 'if one should say that the Greeks had a natural intuition, we know the Creator of nature by natural intuition, as we have also stated (that we know) justice: or if he should say that they possessed a common reason, let us consider who is the author of this.'

§ 95, p. 374. εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ τὰ ἴδια σπεύροντες οἱ πλείονα ποιούσιν. Read, as in Prov. xi. 24, οἱ τὰ ἴδια σπεύροντες πλείονα ποιούσιν. The intrusive relative οἱ was doubtless a marginal correction of the incorrect article.

§ 99, p. 376. ὁ δὲ μεθ' ἑτέρου ποιεῖ ἀτελὲς ὃν καθ' αὐτὸ ἐνεργεῖν, συνεργὸν φάμεν καὶ συναίτιον ἀπὸ τοῦ συναιτίου αἰτίον ὑπάρχον, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρῳ συνελθεῖν αἰτίον γίνεσθαι ὀνομασμένον. Dindorf accepts Sylburg's emendation ὑπάρχον for ὑπάρχειν. Comparing this with the account given of a joint cause in p. 934, I propose to read after ἐνεργεῖν, συνεργὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρῳ συνεργεῖν φάμεν, καὶ συναίτιον τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ σὶν αἰτίῳ αἰτίον ὑπάρχειν ἢ αἰτίον γίνεσθαι ὀνομασμένον, unless αἰτίον γίνεσθαι should be omitted as a gloss.

§ 153, p. 413. In the quotation from Philo, Dindorf fails to remove some blots which had been noted by earlier editors.

ἐνδείκνυται should be ἐνδείκνυνται, τὰ Αἰγυπτίων γράμματα should be τὰ Ἀσσυρίων γράμματα, and for γραμματικὴν below we should probably read γράμματα.

§ 178, p. 425. μόνῃ αὕτῃ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀληθῆ σοφίαν χειραγωγεῖ...οὐκ ἀνευ τοῦ σωτήρος τοῦ καταγαγόντος ἡμῶν τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ὁρατικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἐπιχυθεῖσαν ἐκ φαύλης ἀναστροφῆς ἀγνοίαν ἀχνυῶδη. Here there is no government for ἡμῶν or for τοῦ ὁρατικοῦ, and καταγαγόντος is unmeaning. Perhaps the true reading may be τοῦ καταλλάττοντος ἡμᾶς τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ <καὶ σκεδάσαντος ἀπὸ> τοῦ ὁρατικοῦ.

§ 180, p. 426. Commenting on the words of the *Timaeus* p. 22, Ἕλληνας αἰεὶ παῖδες ἐστε...οὐδὲ (ἔχετε) μᾶθημα χρόνῳ πολλόν οὐδέ, Clement writes ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φησὶ τὴν οἴησιν αὐτῶν βραχὺ τι διαφέρει μύθων· οὐ γὰρ μύθων παιδικὸν ἐξακουστέον οὐδὲ μὴν τῶν τοῖς παισὶ γενομένων μύθων· παῖδας δὲ εἴρηκεν αὐτοὺς γε τοὺς μύθους, ὡς ἂν μικρὸν διορῶντων τὸν παρ' Ἑλλήνων οἰησισόφον, αἰνιττόμενος τὸ μᾶθημα τὸ πολλόν, τὴν παρὰ βαρβάρους προγεγενησμένην ἀλήθειαν, ὃ ῥήματι τέθεικε τὸ παῖς μύθος. The words βραχὺ τι διαφέρει μύθων are taken from *Tim.* 23 B τὰ νῦν δὴ γενεαλογηθέντα...παῖδων βραχὺ τι διαφέρει μύθων, which Clement, if we may judge from his phrase παῖς μύθος, seems to have understood as if μύθων and παῖδων were in apposition. I should propose therefore to insert παῖδων before βραχὺ τι—the similarity of ending explains its loss after αὐτῶν—to insert οὐκ before ἐξακουστέον (childish stories may still be told to children, it is the παῖς μύθος which is forbidden), to read ἀντιτέθεικε for τέθεικε, so as to provide a government for ῥήματι—the ἀντι would easily disappear after αἰ— and perhaps προγενεστέρων for προγενεστάτην. As we have immediately below ἅμφω κοινῶς τοὺς μύθους αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς λόγους παιδικούς εἶναι παριστάς, I should further be inclined to change αὐτοὺς γε τοὺς μύθους into αὐτοὺς τε τοὺς μύθους καὶ τοὺς λόγους.

§ 181, p. 427. τόνδε γὰρ ἀνθρώπουσι νόμον διέταξε Κρονίων, ἰχθύσι γὰρ καὶ θηροῖς καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεηνοῖς ἐσθμεν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ' αὐτῶν.

ἀνθρώπουσι δ' ἔδωκε δίκην ἢ πολλὸν ἄριστον.

Εἴτ' οὖν τὸν ἅμα τῇ γενέσει φήσκει νόμον εἶτε καὶ τὸν αἰθὺς δοθέντα πλὴν ἐκ θεοῦ, ὁ τε τῆς φύσεως ὁ τε τῆς μαθήσεως νόμος εἰς. Here φήσκει is Sylburg's emendation accepted by Dindorf for the MS. φύσει. The future tense is unmeaning, and φύσει is implied by ὁ τῆς φύσεως νόμος in the line below, answering to ὁ τῆς μαθήσεως, as φύσει νόμον answers here to τὸν αἰθὺς δοθέντα. I provide

a construction for νόμον by removing the full stop after ἀπιστη, when it becomes merely a resumption of νόμον in the first line. I should further restore Hesiod's μὲν

in the second line, which has been assimilated to the preceding γὰρ, and put πλὴν after θεοῦ to begin a new sentence.

J. B. MAYOR.

MR. WALKER ON THE GREEK AORIST.

In discussing the last two instalments of Mr. Walker's morphological investigations it is necessary to keep in mind the ulterior purpose with which he pursues them. Mr. Walker expects to get some evidence to rehabilitate the old doctrine of the Graeco-Italic *Spracheinheit*. I have no prejudice against the doctrine, the case against which has possibly been sometimes pushed too far, but the point is so important that it necessarily claims a front place in what little I have to say. I am afraid I do not fully understand Mr. Walker's position on this question. He is bringing out a feature of 'Graeco-Italian'; and since it is not a survival but a definite new departure in language, it must if proved have considerable cogency in determining the mutual relations of Greek and Italic. The languages have in common their (retention of the primitive?) feminine nouns in -as, much of the formation of the pluperfect, and, if we accept Mr. Walker's theory, an aorist indicative in s made up by the help of the perfect from an s subjunctive and optative. These common features, even if we were to add to them others for which some case might be made, are meagre enough when compared with the large resemblances both in phonology and in morphology which have been unsuccessful in convincing scholars of an Italo Keltic unity. All that is allowed is that the Kelts and Italians were contiguous in some pre-historic period, so that new developments in language passed from one tribe to the other. Probably Mr. Walker means no more than the view corresponding to this: the Greeks were once contiguous to the Italians on the other side, though presumably with very much less communication between them and their neighbours than the ancestors of Brennus and Camillus enjoyed. In such a view we need not quarrel with him, though we may perhaps object to the use of 'Graeco-Italian' in this connexion. It would be more justifiable to speak of our own language as 'French-English' since the Norman invasion. If Mr. Walker does mean more, a

thorough discussion of the tremendous difficulties of the doctrine involved would be needed before such details as the s aorist could be handled. But I must not dwell further on this ambiguity, which would not matter were it not for the certainty that there are plenty of respectable scholars of Latin and Greek in this country who have scarcely an idea that the old doctrine has ever been questioned. I think moreover we shall find that a desire to bring the classical languages into closer morphological contact is in many cases the determining cause of Mr. Walker's abandoning views which at present hold the field, and which as generally simpler and less artificial than his own we shall be tempted to prefer until we see the case against them, as well as the case for an alternative. On this point I need do no more than endorse the criticisms of the Master of Christ's (*C.R.* ii. 163), whose observations might well be taken, *mutatis mutandis*, to characterize the later instalments of Mr. Walker's ingenious and scholarly speculation. A student wishing to judge any such speculations fairly will naturally begin by examining the treatment of the subject in the pages of the great systematizer of modern comparative philology. He will find in the second volume of the *Grundriss* how Brugmann marshals the evidence of all branches of the Indogermanic family with a lucidity all his own, and presents an account which, whether it convinces us or not, must be described as clear, consistent and plausible in a very high degree. Mr. Walker consequently presents his theory under a great disadvantage if he does not attempt to show weak points in such a system which may predispose us to look leniently upon the weak points discoverable in his own.

Before passing from these general criticisms to notice individual points in Mr. Walker's last two papers, I might mention one or two recent investigations in verb morphology which should I think be taken into account. One is the virtual discovery of the Sanskrit type *ājais*, applied by

Bezenberger to solve the riddle of *ἀγεις* (see Brugmann *Grd.* ii. 896), and by Bartholomae to '*erās = āsis*,' as well as several other formations (see his *Studien* ii. p. 63 *sqq.*). On the subject of the Greek, Italic and Celtic *ss* aorist a very important contribution has been made by Bartholomae (*B.B.* xii. 80 *sqq.*); and the same question has been acutely attacked by Mr. Giles (*Camb. Philolog. Soc. Tr.* 1889, p. 126 *sqq.*) on very different lines. I am not endorsing here any of this literature, but I mention it as likely to modify in some way the investigations before us.¹

I proceed to take a few points from these papers in order. One I take from paper viii. (*C.R.* v. 451), because Mr. Walker asks us to lay special stress on it, connecting it in advance with the papers to follow. His treatment of the difficult word for 'spring' contains some points that need further proof. Thus when it is said that the Attic *ἐαπ* must have lost a *ϕ*, not a *σ*, we remember that the author has been laying some stress on the explanation of *τιθέασαι* as = *τιθε-σάντι*. Mr. Walker may if he likes save his *ἐαπ* by annexing Johansson's *τιθε-ϕ-άντι*, but of course that involves more inconvenient results still. I am not proposing to re-examine *ἐαπ ἦρος* *ver* here, only staying to remark on the Greek that the explanation ought perhaps to take the exactly similar *κέαρ κῆρος* into consideration, and on the Latin that the Old Norse *vār* is a much more obvious parallel than the Greek *ἐαπ*, whether or no *ἦρ* be brought in. I think that this word is much too ambiguous to illustrate the general propositions Mr. Walker lays down at the end, though I should not quarrel with them in themselves. The consensus of the Indo-Iranians and the Slavo-Lithuanians is not enough to prove a word Indogermanic, simply because these two languages are proved to have belonged to the same dialectic division of the parent speech, as is shown by their treatment of the palatals and velars. Nor can any warning be more important than that which forbids our applying to one language morphological observations established in another—unless, as I should prefer to put it, these completely satisfy the known phonetic and other conditions of both. But Mr. Walker is hardly entitled by his theory of *ἐαπ ver* to hint that 'the connexion between' Greek and Italic 'is of the closest.'

¹ Since this paper was written, Streitberg's very important article on the 'Dehnstufe' has come out, materially affecting several of the points discussed here (*Ind. Forsch.* iii. 305 *sqq.*).

The three propositions with which the present theory of the Greek Aorist is introduced will be best examined under the details of the proof. I may observe here that the second, which is far more plausible than the first—(the third is generally admitted, if we drop the 'Graeco-Italian')—must be extended beyond Greek and Italian if it is to be allowed. Mr. Walker will hardly venture to assign the Sanskrit (and Iranian) *s* aorist to a different origin, and in that case the extension to the indicative must belong to the proethnic period (rather an unsafe region, by the way, for us to assert or deny morphological processes alleged to have happened therein). If the theory is modified in this direction, it may very well be regarded as a kind of extension of Mr. Giles's theory to the Indogermanic: the *s* subjunctive and optative being simply forms of *es* 'to be' tacked on to a verbal root-noun. One difficulty at least will result, besides the *a priori* risk of speculating for a dialect in which we have no history and no comparative process to guide us. The most prominent feature of the Sanskrit *s* aorist, which is probably shared by Greek, Italic and Germanic, is the so called *vṛddhi* of the root in the active indicative. This is intelligible on the ordinary theory: I am disposed still to adhere to my own conjecture² (*Am. Journ. Phil.* x. 286) that it originated in roots with initial vowel, where the augment contracted with the root in its strong and weak forms. But it constitutes a rather serious difficulty to Mr. Walker's account.

The identity of the suffixes of aorist and perfect is obvious in Greek, with one or two considerable reservations: their assimilation is easily explained by the ordinary accounts, such as Brugmann's. But the 3rd plural is a more serious difficulty than Mr. Walker thinks. His hypothetical *μεπας* depends on the Sanskrit *-us -ur*. But unfortunately this is conclusively shown by Zend to be a combination of two suffixes existing in Indo-Iranian, *-r* and *-s* (see Bartholomae, *K.Z.* xxix. 586). Even if the *s* were original in Sanskrit, we could not possibly reconcile the vowels. This upsets the external authority for *μεπας*, and, as we have seen, Mr. Walker is unable to support it without entirely separating *μεμάσαι* and *τιθέασαι*. This difficulty (to say nothing of others) must be surmounted before the Graeco-Italian identity of aorist and perfect can be maintained. And when we reflect on the remarkable coincidences undeniably

² See, however, Streitberg, *l.c.* p. 391 *sqq.*

existing, without any historical connexion, between formations in languages totally distinct, we shall probably feel that a much more startling identity of Greek and Latin phenomena would hardly bear the weight laid on this very doubtful one. Moreover, did not Germanic likewise merge its aorist and perfect? As to Mr. Walker's assertion that no one has ever conjectured an original *s* indicative corresponding to *essem* and *ferrem*, it is not going very far to bring up *abhārsīt* (Vedic) and the Greek *ἔφερον* (Hesych.); while Lithuanian gives us some forms that presumably started from the indicative (see Brugmann *Grd.* ii. 1172). It seems to me at least possible to take *στῆσα* = *starem*, *γίγθσα* = *gauderem*, etc., as historically accurate equations (barring the restoration of intervocalic *σ* in Greek by analogy of the consonant stems), and to put them both down as *Injunctives*. The *Injunctive* (or unaugmented indicative past tenses) included two main uses, one quasi-conjunctive, as commonly in Sanskrit, the other indicative, where past time was inferred from the context, as presumably was the case in the pre-historic stages of Achaian (Homeric) Greek and of Italic, and other languages which wholly or partially dropped the use of the augment in the indicative. The equation I suggest will hold also for the 3rd plural: *γίγθσαν* = *gauderent*, from Idg. *gāyēdhēsēnt*, if we may for the moment assume the early extension of *s* aorists to the derivative verbs.¹ In equating *στῆσαν* and *stārent* we have to allow for the coincident extension of the strong ablaut of the singular: compare Skt. (middle) *asthiṣata* and *ἔστασαν*, also *dōsan* = *dārent*, Skt. *adhiṣata*, against the conceivably original sing. *ἔδωσα*. The completion of the tense in Latin by the help of such analogies as *amem*, *ament*, with *ē* throughout, would be a very natural process, and this would anchor the form to the subjunctive mood, while from the older injunctive forms *dixem*, *diximus*, *dixitis*, *dixent*, two may well have gone to add another tributary to the newly forming stream of the aorist-perfect indicative. The suggestiveness of Mr. Walker's comparisons must be my excuse for launching out on a supplementary guess of my own towards the solution of that perennial problem, the imperfect subjunctive in Latin. While I am thus employed, I may as well add one or two more hints in the same line. What

if *ferres* is really to be compared with the Skt. *abhārsīs*, adopting Bartholomae's principle that this rather mysterious suffix appeared originally as *ēi* in the singular and *ī* in the plural, with inevitable levelling in both directions? The appropriation of the whole tense from injunctive to subjunctive remains as before. And lastly, let us notice the phenomena of the *s* aorist in a root like *trā*, with an irreducible *ā*, in Latin and Sanskrit: the extant 1st pl. mid. *atrāsmahi* in the latter will allow us to construct the active corresponding. In the singular, *(a)trāsam* = *(in)trārem*; **atrās(s)* **atrāst* would be **intrās* **intrāst*, while the co-existent *atrāsīs* *atrāsīt* will on my theory be *intrārēs* *intrāret*. Then in the plural *atrāsma* would be **intrāmus*, *atrāsta* is *intrāstis*, and **atrāsan* *intrārent*. Here **intrūs* and **intrāmus* naturally do not survive their likeness to the present, and **intrāst* is the only form which has not been actually used in one way or another.

I must hasten on to notice a few points of detail suggesting themselves in Mr. Walker's last two papers. The account of the types *στῆσω* and *στῆσιν* as sigmatic (Idg. *sthāsō*, *sthēsēm*) is plausible enough, and might very well be accepted without in any way impugning the originality of *ἔστησα*, which will be either a *ss* aorist or a reformation on the analogy of the *ἔδειξα* type. Of course the analogy of *σταῖμεν* will explain the retention of *ι* in *στῆσιν* perfectly, but one must confess that the optative *sthēsēm* practically rests on Greek evidence alone, though the Sanskrit *stheyām* will give us some trouble if we discard the help from this quarter. The hypothetical unthematic aorist—which simply means a past tense of the 'root-class' or *εἶμ*-conjugation—raises a number of very knotty questions. Are there in consonant stems the traces we should expect of the weakened root in a formation said to survive only in the middle? What is the relation of *δέχαται* to *ἐδέχμην*, and of *ἄλεται* to *ἄλτο*? In this last question I should agree with Mr. Walker that *ἄλτο* is not a sigmatic aorist (cf. Brugmann *Grd.* ii. 1283), but the equally unsigmatic subjunctive will not suit him so well. The wide extension of the *ss* aorist is a point on which I have always felt that Bartholomae made a strong case. Mr. Walker's extension of it to the *ἔστησα* type is an alluring suggestion, to which I know no objection except its cutting off *starem*.

I pass on to paper x., many points in which may fairly be allowed as probable without accepting the thesis upon which

¹ For the 3rd pl. *-ent*, levelled to *-av(τ)* in Greek by contamination of *-a(τ)* = *-at* and *-ev(τ)*, see Streitberg in *Ind. Forsch.* i. 82 sqq.

they are based. That the past tenses of *oīda*, *είμι* and *είμυ* reacted upon one another is very likely indeed, but that does not depend on the doctrine of an unreduplicated perfect, as set forth in Mr. Walker's earlier papers. The introduction of the parallel root *vei* to help out *ei* is an excellent proposal: we may compare the way in which three roots (*se*, *tek* and *vei*) make up the conjugation of *τιμυ*. I should be inclined also to accept the main points in the suggested genesis of *ἦεσθα* and *ἦδεσθα*, with some reservations noted below. But I am afraid I remain entirely unconvinced as to the main thesis which these forms are supposed to confirm. As far as I can see, it relies simply on two undeniable facts, (1) that in Greek the *s*-aorist and the perfect active had the same person-endings, except in the 3rd plural, and (2) that in Latin the perfect and aorists coalesced (as they coalesced in Germanic). But both facts are easily understood on very much simpler assumptions, and apart from this resemblance no two sets of forms could be much less alike than the Greek and the Latin: what resemblances in detail they have are shown at once by other languages to be inherited. Some observations remain to be made on points of the proof. I do not understand how *monerim* is connected with a perfect stem: surely it is a 'first aorist optative' like *faxim*, *capsim*, *amarim*, etc.? That *Feīdō* should be the true Homeric subjunctive of *Foīda* is natural enough, as it is the normal form of the perfect subjunctive. *Feīdeō* on the ordinary view is the *-es*-aorist subjunctive of the root *veid*, and was only attached to the perfect because it happened to be unreduplicated and in need of a past tense such as *ἦFeīde(σ)α* would supply. The usefulness of *δεδία* as an analogy force I should question: it is itself a comparatively late and decidedly restricted product of analogy. A Homeric '*ἦδησθα*' might stand I imagine for *Feīdeσθα* (unaugmented), by the familiar misinterpretation of an early E. Of course the *-θα* suffix is not 'retained' here, as it only came in from the perfect owing to the close association just mentioned. But I think the association may well have begun at a time even prior to the loss of intervocalic *σ*, so that the similarity of *Foīda* and *Feīdeσθα* could be continued by the development of *Feīdeσθα* *Feīdere* to supply the place of the doomed **Feīders* **Feīdort*. The Latin *vidisti* represents apparently a very similar independent process at work on the *-is*-aorist—(if we are really compelled to adopt this

rather unwelcome formation to explain an otherwise unsolved phonetic peculiarity). The augmenting of this aorist with *ἦ-* has surely no necessary connexion with the digamma initial? *Ἡβουλόμην*, *ἠδυνάμην*, etc., show that this substitute for the augment—best taken perhaps as a preposition identical with Latin *ē*—was free to join any verb. Its frequency with digammated roots may well mean nothing more than the recognized change of *ēf-* to *ēv-* in the primitive Achaian dialect, joined presumably with one or two genuine cases of *ἦ-* accounting for *ἐώπων* and its congeners.

Mr. Walker will hardly expect to pass without protest the 'conditions under which *ι* becomes in its strong form *ει* or *ι* respectively.' Adherents of the newer philology have learnt to regard *ι* and *ῑ* as standing on a different platform from *ει*, though few would care to regard the position of *ῑ* as finally settled. But the lax use of 'become' here is very unfortunate, however little intended, as there are far too many still who would innocently speak of an *ῑ* 'strengthened' to *ει*, as though our science were bound for ever to the phraseology of the old Indian grammarians. To restore a 'lost imperfect of *είμι*' as *iv* is *ῑ* ignores the fact that we have in Sanskrit *āyam*, *ās*, *āt*, perfectly normal forms which would be very hard to explain if the type *ābhūs*, *ābhūt*, *ēphūs*, *ēphū* (as yet not fully accounted for)¹ had to be followed. The *āyam* is exactly represented by **ἦα*, which borrowed an *ι* subscript from the plural. Then we can interpret *ἦα* as a contamination of *ἦα* and **ἦεα*, without questioning the tradition: the regular (unaugmented) 3rd pl. 1st aor. *ισαν* would help the process. On my supposition *irem* (= *eism*) is the 1st sg. injunctive aorist, of which *ισαν* is 3rd pl., *irent* having the long vowel of the singular. One or two small points and I have done. The 'unvoiced *σ* in *ἦσαν* from *oīda*' and the 'voiced *σ* in *ἦσαν* from *ἦα*' can hardly be accepted without a proof. As to *τιθέασι*, etc., the development of a new 3rd pl. primary suffix *-avri* out of the aorist *-av*, by the proportion *-v* to *-vri* familiar in all verbs, is the simplest explanation: the new suffix *-avri* was added to the base *τιθε-* just as the new past suffix *-σαν* was added in the imperfect. The plural of the reduplicated *-μι* verbs is of course a

¹ *bhū* is the proper reduction of the dissyllabic root *bhūye*; and there is no real difficulty in supposing that Sanskrit and Greek independently levelled the singular to the plural. Note that the type is not found in Iranian.

problem in any case: we can hardly doubt that the original forms *τιθ-μεν *τιθ-ατι have been reacted on in a pre-historic period of Greek by the forms of the unreduplicated conjugation, Idg. *dhomēs dhénti*, *θέμεν *θέντι (cf. the 2nd aorist). In that case the Doric τίθεντι is clearly more original, but the Ionic accent may very well represent the consciousness of another form after the type of τιθέασι, Boeot. διδάσθαι: the evident antiquity of this type is certainly a point in favour of Johansson, as referred to above. In the verb *esmi* there were two forms in the plural, *ēsytī* and *sēnti*, *ἔσμεν and *ἐντι, and the ultimate forms of these (*ἔσμεν*, *ἐντι*) probably did more than anything else to fix the alternatives in τίθημι.

Here I must close my remarks, in which I have ventured perhaps rather farther than is wise from the safe paths of merely negative criticism. The novelty of Mr. Walker's ideas and the long-felt fascination of this field of verb morphology must be my excuse. Two impressions remain in my

mind as I account to myself for a general lack of conviction produced by these very original researches. On the one side is the absence of the necessary destructive criticism, which might clear away the structures occupying at present the ground Mr. Walker wishes to annex. On the other is the feeling that Mr. Walker is before all things a classical scholar, with the inevitable prejudice in favour of Greek and Latin as better able to tell us the secrets of primitive language than any other dialects can be. A heavier sprinkling of words from Zend and Sanskrit, Gothic, Old Irish, Lithuanian, and sources less classical still, would doubtless send off the pure scholar or the archaeologist with a shrug to more congenial pages in the *Review*, but it would produce more effect upon students of a subject more and more imperatively demanding the thorough traversing of the whole field.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Cambridge, March 16th.

ON ST. JOHN'S METHOD OF RECKONING THE HOURS OF THE DAY.

ALL admit that, with the exception of the Fourth Gospel, the New Testament (Mt. xx. 3, 5, 6, 9, xxvii. 45, 46; Mk. xv. 25, 33, 34; Lk. xxiii. 44; Acts ii. 15, iii. 1, x. 3, 9, 30, xxiii. 33) reckons 'the hour' from sunrise (or sunset in Acts xxiii. 33 where 'of the night' is added). But it is contended that St. John may have adopted a different reckoning, namely from midnight (or mid-day).

Westcott (*Gospel of St. John*, p. 282) mentions 'two passages' which 'furnish a sufficient presumption' that the reckoning from midnight was general in the Roman province of Asia and was adopted by John. One of these refers to the death of Polycarp, another to that of Pionius who 'is said to have been martyred (at Smyrna also) at the tenth hour.'¹ The latter, if Pionius died in A.D. 250, is not cogent concerning the usage of 100 A.D. As to the former, Westcott says, 'This'—the eighth hour—'from the circumstances, must have been 8 A.M.' But Lightfoot (*Apost. Fathers* P. II. Vol. i. p. 612) says 'The hour of the day we have no means of testing. "The eighth hour" might mean either 8 A.M. or 2 P.M.'; and,

The reference to the authority, in the case of Pionius, is not given.

though he pronounces the former the more probable, he adds, 'Either is consistent with the narrative.'

But, upon close examination, the evidence as to Polycarp will be found in favour of 2 P.M. and incompatible with 8 A.M. For it would appear that Polycarp was not brought into the stadium till (*Epist. Smyrn.* 9) the 'sports' had begun. When he was led into the stadium, the excitement was at its height (8), 'such a tumult that no man's voice could be so much as heard.' The words (*ib.* 9), 'at length, when he was brought up (λοιπόν προσαχθέντος αὐτοῦ)'—perhaps 'at length' is rather strong for λοιπόν, but I am quoting Lightfoot's translation—imply that the martyr had to wait his turn till the 'sports' were concluded; and this is further implied by (*ib.* 11) the proconsul's threat, 'I have wild beasts at hand here and I will throw thee to them,' taken with what follows. The people shout for a lion to be let loose on Polycarp, upon which the Asiarch replied that (12) 'It was not lawful for him, since he had brought the sports to a close (πεπληρώκει τὰ κινήσια).' Now it is most unlikely that 'the sports' could have been 'brought to a close' in time enough to allow Polycarp to be examined by

the Proconsul, and a fire to be extemporized to consume him, and all this by 8 A.M. on a February morning (*ib.* 21, *πρὸ ἐπὶ Καλανδῶν Μαρτίων*).

The passages in John bearing on the subject are the following:—

(a) i. 39 'about the tenth hour.' The Baptist is here introduced as 'looking upon Jesus as he was walking (*περιπατοῦντι*). The walking does not necessarily imply anything in the nature of a journey. Two disciples of the Baptist, wishing to know Jesus, ask 'Where abidest thou?' They 'came therefore and saw where he abode; and they abode with him that day (*παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην*): it was about the tenth hour.' There is nothing here conclusive either way; but the most natural supposition is that they took the evening meal there and remained for the night as well as the remainder of the day. (It should be hardly necessary to quote, for 'day' used loosely in connexion with hours after or before sunset, Mk. xiv. 30 'to-day, even this night,' and Matth. xxvii. 19, where Pilate's wife speaks of the dream she had had 'this day.')

(b) iv. 6 'about the sixth hour.' This was the hour at which Jesus rested at 'Jacob's well,' wearied with the journey, while the disciples went into the city to buy food. Now, if this was 'the sixth hour of the afternoon,' i.e. 6 P.M. as in modern reckoning, we have to suppose that the woman came to the well shortly after 6 P.M. and that the dialogue followed afterwards (lasting long enough to allow of the return of the disciples to interrupt it): then the woman returned to the city and told her story to the men; and then the men came out to Jesus, heard His words, welcomed Him, and induced Him to remain with them. Even if this occurred in the summer it crowds a great deal into a small space of time; but if it occurred in winter it is almost impossible.

Here rises the question of the time of year, and of the bearing on this point of John iv. 35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Ἐτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαὶ εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν. The words 'lift up your eyes' appear to mean 'lift up your eyes to the truth as it is in heaven,' 'discern the true harvest'; and the most probable rendering is, 'You (*ὕμεις* emph.) the children of men, who talk of earthly seed and earthly harvest, say, or are in the habit of saying, "Four months more and the harvest [of earth] will come";

but I tell you the harvest [of heaven] is white already.'

It appears (Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 399 and 583, quoted by Westcott, John iv. 34) that corn sown *just after Christmas* was four inches high on 20 Feb., and that the harvest lasted from about 15 April to 15 May. This gives an interval of 'four months' between seed-time and the average time for the middle of harvest, and points to a common proverb by which the farmers in Galilee exhorted one another to patience, after seed-time was over. (The *ἐτι* does not mean 'more,' and creates no difficulty; comp. the saying of Joseph to Pharaoh's butler, Gen. xl. 13 *ἐτι τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ μνησθήσεται Φ. τῆς ἀρχῆς σου*, 'Three days hence, Pharaoh will remember thy office': = so *ib.* 19 and vii. 34.

Now it might seem at first sight as if all the bearing of the 'four months' upon the actual time of year disappears as soon as it is admitted that the words probably constitute a proverb. But in fact, all the point of our Lord's words consists in the *exact application of the proverb to the time of utterance, and in the contrariety between what the proverb said about the earthly harvest and what He said about the spiritual*. For the former, the seed had only just been sown, and the fields were bare; for the latter, the harvest was white for reaping, if the disciples would only 'lift up their eyes' and discern it. Consequently, though the words are probably proverbial, their use here is strongly for winter as the time of utterance.

This makes it all the more unlikely that 'the sixth hour' meant the last hour in the evening. In the winter the Samaritan woman might naturally come to the well in the early afternoon; and in the winter people might naturally be travelling at noon. And the rest of the narrative will suit a winter noon-tide. Jesus had not intended to stay there; He merely rested at noon because He was 'tired out' (*κεκοπιακώς*); but the talk with the Samaritan woman led the Samaritans to come out to see Him in the afternoon; and the consequence was that they induced Him to remain in their city for that night and the next.

(c) iv. 52 'Yesterday, about (?) the seventh hour (*ἔχθες ὥραν ἑβδόμην*), the fever left him.' [Winer quotes for the accus. Acts x. 3, Rev. iii. 3. But in Acts the best MSS. ins. *περί*: Rev. οὐ μὴ γνῶς ποίαν ὥραν ἤξω possibly contains some corruption concealed under the marginal *γνώση*: in any

case, the juxtaposition of γῶς, and the solecisms with which Rev. abounds, make it worthless as an instance bearing on the present passage. Possibly the original was ΕΧΘΕΕΙC (comp. Plutarch, *Timoleon*, ed. Holden, index, εἰς with the meaning of ἐν, temporal, εἰς ἕνα καιρόν xii. 3, and he compares Polyb. xxiv. 34, 10 εἰς τὴν ἐπαύριον ἐξῆλθε).

But let us assume that, so far as the hour is concerned, the text is correct. Westcott says (*ad loc.*) that 'the uncertainty of the site of Cana causes a little difficulty in determining the time required for the journey from Capernaum to Cana. This may however be fairly reckoned at about four or five hours. Comp. Jos. *Vit.* ch. 17; a night journey from Cana to Tiberias.'

Now Josephus tells us that he travelled from Cana to Tiberias all through the night (δὲ ὅλης τῆς νυκτός)—and he had every motive to travel fast, as his object was to secure Tiberias from being brought over by his enemy. Moreover he was journeying downhill, and it would take longer to go uphill from the border of the low-lying lake to the uplands of Cana. We may therefore reckon Josephus' journey at 7 to 8 hours and the return journey at 9 or 10; this gives about 17 hours of journeying, too much to be done at a stretch.

The most probable supposition is that the father started from Capernaum very early in the morning, say at 4 or 5 A.M., and reached Jesus in eight or nine hours, at 1 P.M. ('the seventh hour'). After the delay necessary for rest and refreshment, he started on the return journey, but stopped when night came on, and resumed his journey next morning. His servants did not start to meet him on the afternoon of the boy's recovery; for, by the time they had convinced themselves that danger was over, say 2 P.M., it was too late to allow them to reach Cana before sunset. But they started very early in the morning and met their master 'when he was by this time descending (ᾧδῃ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος)'—a phrase which may here mean (a little more precisely than in iv. 49, 'Sir, come down') the descent from the table-land to the border of the lake.

But on the supposition (adopted by Westcott) that the words of Jesus were spoken at 7 P.M., we have to ask how it was that the father (who most probably started before sunrise) was so late in finding Jesus, taking, say, fourteen hours to reach Him. Also, the pressing petition to Jesus ('Come down, ere my child die') is much more natural at

1 P.M., when there was time for the journey to be at all events commenced, than at 7 P.M., when it would be rather unreasonable to ask a Prophet to begin a journey that would last, as it did for Josephus, 'all through the night.' This last argument is all the more forcible because this incident occurred only a few days after the dialogue in Samaria, and therefore probably in the winter; so that the sun would have set long before 7 P.M.

(d) xix. 14 'about the sixth hour.' This passage states the hour when Pilate pronounced sentence on Jesus; and, as the context stands, is unquestionably incompatible with Mk. xv. 25, which fixes the Crucifixion at 'the third hour.' But the omission of Mk. xv. 25 by Mt. and Lk. indicates some early obscurity as to the exact hour.

In any case the interpretation of 'the sixth hour' as 6 A.M. involves other extreme difficulties: for (Westcott on John xviii. 28) 'the Roman court could be held at any time after sunrise, but not before; but at 6 A.M. the sun would only just have risen, so that the Chief Priests could not expect to begin the trial till that time. And yet, according to this interpretation, we have to suppose that (xviii. 29–32) the dialogue between Pilate and the Jews, (xviii. 33–37) the dialogue between Pilate and Jesus, (xviii. 39–40) the expostulation of Pilate with the Jews and the choice of Barabbas instead of Jesus, (xix. 1) the scourging, (xix. 2, 3) the clothing with the purple robe and the crown of thorns and the offering of mock homage, (xix. 4–7) the exhibition of Jesus in this condition to the Jews and Pilate's further expostulation with them, (xix. 8–11) Pilate's re-entry into the Palace and further dialogue with Jesus, (xix. 12) Pilate's subsequent attempts (ἐκ τούτου ἐζήτει) to procure an acquittal, and the recalcitration of the Jews, (xix. 13) the leading of Jesus to Gabbatha and (apparently) the erection of a tribunal (βῆμα, not τὸ βῆμα) there—all occur after 6 A.M. in the course of about half-an-hour, so as to justify the writer in saying that the final sentence was pronounced 'about 6.30 A.M.' (Westc. *Gosp.* p. 282, 'If we suppose that the time approximately described was about 6 A.M. it is not difficult to fit in all the events of the trial'). If to this we were to add Mt.'s incidents of the washing of Pilate's hands, and the message about his wife's dream, and Lk.'s supplementary trial of Jesus by Herod, and the mocking by Herod's soldiers, and the sending back

from Herod to Pilate, the difficulty—if it did not amount to an impossibility before—would certainly amount to one now.

Strong evidence would be needed to make us believe that John departed from the synoptic method of reckoning the hours of the day. The substance of the synoptic Gospels—it is generally admitted—was widely read and recognized as authoritative at the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel. The Fourth Gospel—according to a very ancient and general tradition—was composed to supplement them and to give a more spiritual aspect of Christ's life, but not to supersede them. But if the Fourth

was intended to be read with the Three, would it not have been a grievous and even culpable error to introduce, without warning or even suggestion of difference, a method of reckoning the hours (and more especially as regards the Passion, where the four authors cover the same ground and all enter into considerable detail) wholly different from that of the Synoptists, and certain to create confusion in the minds of all readers? So far, the evidence alleged by Westcott (and I have dealt with no other) appears insufficient to prove such a departure.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

THEOPHILUS AD AUTOLYCUM II, 7.

ἀλλὰ καὶ Σάτυρος, ἱστορῶν τοὺς δῆμους Ἀλεξανδρείῳ, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Φιλοπάτορος τοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου προσαγορευθέντος, τοῦτον μὴνυε Διόνυσον ἀρχηγέτην γεγονέναι διὰ καὶ φυλὴν ὁ Πτολεμαῖος πρώτην κατέστησεν. Λέγει οὖν ὁ Σάτυρος οὕτως·

Here follows the genealogy purporting to connect the Ptolemies with Dionusos; after which Theophilus continues:—

Ἡ μὲν οὖν πρὸς Διόνυσον τοῖς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλεύσασι συγγένεια, οὕτω περιέχει. Ὅθεν καὶ ἐν τῇ Διονυσίᾳ φυλὴ δῆμοι εἰσὶ κατακεχωρισμένοι. Ἀλθῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης γυναικὸς Διονύσου, θυγατρὸς δὲ Θεοτίου Ἀλθῆας. Δηϊανείρης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Διονύσου καὶ Ἀλθῆας, γυναικὸς δὲ Ἡρακλέους, ὅθεν καὶ τὰς προσωνομίας ἔχουσιν οἱ κατ' αὐτοὺς δῆμοι. Ἀριάδνης ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς Μίνω, γυναικὸς δὲ Διονύσου, παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσω ἐν μορφῇ πρίμνιδι. Θεοτίς ἀπὸ Θεοτίου τοῦ Ἀλθῆας πατρὸς. Θεαντίς ἀπὸ Θεάντος παιδὸς Διονύσου. Σταφυλὶς ἀπὸ Σταφύλου νιού Διονύσου. Μαρωνὶς ἀπὸ Μάρωνος νιού Ἀριάδνης καὶ Διονύσου. οὗτοι γὰρ πάντες νιοὶ Διονύσου.

I give the passage 'with all faults' as it stands in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* tom. vi., coll. 1057—60, since I am here concerned only with the obscure words underlined. An Appendix containing the conjectures and emendations of J. H. Nolte speaks thus of the clause in question:—

Locus haud dubie corruptus. Neque interpretum explicationes neque Toupii ep. p. 177 et Meinekei Anal. Alex. et Mulleri *Frag. Histor. Graec.* iv. p. 660, coniecturae

probabiles sunt. Legendum *πρηνήτοῦ* αὐτῷ προσύμνου (cf. Clem. Alex. *Prot.* p. 29 P et Arnob. e. nat. 5, 29) alibi olim proposui.

Toup *l.c.* remarks: 'Appello omnes monstrorum averruncatores, an quidquam viderint hac lectione monstrosius,' and comparing the statement in Hom. *Od.* A 325 rewrites the passage with confidence ('procul dubio') as follows: τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσω ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Δίᾳ. Meineke *op. cit.* p. 347 hazards τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσω ἐν ὁροφῇ πρηνναίᾳ, which C. Müller *l.c.* rightly condemns as 'nimis quaesita' and unwarranted by tradition. He himself offers with some hesitation ἐν κορυφῇ δρυμῳδαί, citing Diodorus v. 51, 4: Διόνυσος δὲ νυκτὸς ἀπήγαγε τὴν Ἀριάδνην εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Δρίος. As an alternative he suggests that the words παιδὸς...πρίμνιδι may have crept into the text from some such gloss as the following: τῆς Μίνω παιδὸς καὶ Πασιφάης τῆς μυχθείσης [Μινωταύρω] ἐν [βοὸς] μορφῇ πρηνίῳ.

It will be seen that these scholars unanimously proceed on the assumption that the words παιδὸς...πρίμνιδι are descriptive of Ariadne. Dr. Jackson, however, who first drew my attention to the passage, observes that in that case the iteration of the word Διονύσω is strange. It is not used more than once in any of the parallel clauses, and had a repetition been required we should have expected the pronoun αὐτῷ. This may be taken as an indication that the words παιδὸς...πρίμνιδι cover the name and eponym of another deme.

Assuming, then, that in the clause παιδὸς πατροφίλης, τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσω ἐν μορφῇ πρίμνιδι we have to look for the name of a

fresh deme and its mythological derivation, we first note that the MSS. read not *πατροφίλης*—which is a conjecture of Wolf's—but *πατροφίλας*. Now it is true that *πατροφίλας* is an incredible form for a prose writer of the second century of our era; but so also is *πατροφίλης*. The probability is that such a writer would not have used such a compound at all; and, had he done so, he would assuredly have written *πατροφίλου* for its genitive case singular. But the form *πατροφίλας*, though foreign to prose, would be perfectly legitimate in verse; indeed it actually occurs in an epigram by an anonymous author, *Anth. Pal.* vii. 221, 2. This consideration leads me to suppose (1) that the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* are the beginning of a hexameter verse, and (2) that they have ousted from the text the name which they were intended to illustrate.

Can we, it may be asked, go a step further and restore the lost eponym? I think we can, though in the absence of documentary proof the matter must of course remain conjectural. Among the traditional amours of Dionusos there is one to which the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* seem peculiarly applicable, and that one is not Ariadne. For Wolf's suggestion that *πατροφίλος* is used ironically to denote 'betraying her father' is a mere makeshift. The Greek for 'loving her father,' whether in jest or earnest, would be *φιλοπάτωρ* (cp. *φιλομήτωρ*, *φιλάδελφος*, κ.τ.λ.): our word must be passive (cp. *Ἀρρήφίλος*, *Λεώφίλος*, κ.τ.λ.) and means 'loved by her father,' an epithet which in its present connection suits Pallene and no one else. The main outlines of the story are these. Dionusos journeying through Thrace encountered King Sithon—

Παλλήνης γενέτην θανατηφόρον, ὃς ποτε κοίρης
οἶστρον ἔχων ἀθέμιστον ἀμαρτιγάμων ἡμεναίων,
συζυγίην ἀνέκοπτεν· ἀμετρήτους δὲ δαΐζων
μελλογάμους μνηστήρας ἀπέθρισε, ὃν ὑπὸ
λύθρῳ
κτεινομένων καναχιδὸν ἐφοίνισσοντο παλαί-
στραι.

(Nonnos: *Dion.* xlviii. 93—7.)

Undeterred by the fate of previous wooers, Dionusos demanded Pallene as his bride,

καὶ αἰτίζοντι Λναίῳ
φρικτὸς ἀνὴρ κήρυξε παλαισμοσύνην ἡμεναίων.
(Id. *ib.* 101—2.)

Pallene in the guise of a wrestler entered the lists. The god was victorious, wedded his antagonist, and slew her importunate

parent. It is patent that the phrase *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* exactly hits off the daughter of this *δυσέρωτα τοκῆα* (Id. *ib.* 205).

But we have still to examine the words *ἐν μορφῇ πρίμνιδι*. Despite Wolf's attempted rendering 'forma obversa' and W. G. Humphry's 'aliena forma,' *πρίμνιδι* is a *vox nihili*. Correction must, I think, be based on the foregoing legend. The only metamorphosis there described is that Pallene, the personified promontory, met Dionusos *in the guise of a female wrestler*. Hence I submit that possibly, if not probably, we should read *ἐν μορφῇ γυμνάδι*. The Γ of *γυμνάδι* may by a well-known error (see Bast, *Comment. Palaeog.* p. 710) have passed into the short-limbed Π, and the meaningless *πρίμνιδι* have resulted from the consequent confusion. But if *γυμνάδι* be accepted as palaeographically possible, it must be confessed that *ἐν μορφῇ γυμνάδι* is an odd phrase to denote 'in the guise of a female wrestler.' In fact, for a writer of plain prose I should say that it was out of the question: at the same time it appears to me just such an extravagant expression as we should look for in a poet of the decadence. I am therefore inclined to suppose that *ἐν μορφῇ γυμνάδι* formed part of the verse quotation from which I conceive the words *παιδὸς πατροφίλας* to be an excerpt. I refrain from including *τῆς μυχθείσης Διονύσω* in the inverted commas, although as the text stands *παιδὸς...Διονύσω* is a passable hexameter, because it seems to me probable that the writer would cull two isolated phrases or perhaps the first five feet of a line, rather than one complete verse and three words from the middle of another without interposition of his own.

In brief, I hold that Theophilus, who in Book ii. is constantly quoting scraps of Greek poetry, penned the passage somewhat as follows:—

1. Ἀριαδνείς ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρὸς
2. Μίνω γυναῖκος διὲ Διονύσου
3. <Παλληνεὶς ἀπὸ Παλλήνης>
4. 'παιδὸς πατροφίλας τῆς
5. μυχθείσης Διονύσω 'ἐν μορφῇ
6. γυμνάδι'. Θεοστιεὶς κ.τ.λ.

Line 3 would be likely enough to drop out before line 4, since both begin with ΠΔ and both end with ΗC, the resultant text being the MS. reading.

I gather, then, that in the Alexandrine *φυλὴ Διονυσία* there was a ninth deme called

Pallene. This in itself will not appear improbable, when we recollect that it was the Greeks in Alexandria who were thus divided into tribes and demes (see Pauly, *Real-Encyc.* ed. 2, col. 1378 *fin.*), and that

at Athens there was in fact an important deme belonging to the tribe Antiochis which bore the name Pallene (see Indices to *C.I.G.* and *C.I.A.*).

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK.

AD BABRII FABULAS NUPER REPERTAS.

BABRII fabulam inscriptam *νῖος καὶ λέων γεγραμμένος* e tabulis ceratis Lugdunensibus inde a vs. 12 sic repraesentavit collega meus aestimatissimus van Leeuwen in *Mnemosyne Batava* a. 1894, 2, p. 225 :

- καὶ δὴ ποτε στὰς τοῦ λέοντος οὐ πόρρω
 “κακείστε σὺ τὸν ψεύστην
 ὄνειρον ὄμμα[σιν πα]τρὸς δείξας
 15 ἔχεις με φρουρὰ πε[ριβα]λὼν γυναικεία.
 τί δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ λόγοισιν κοῦκ ἔργον
 ποίω”
 τοίχῳ δὲ χεῖρας (del. v. L.) ἐπέβαλε τὸν
 λέοντα τυφλώσων.
 σκόλοψ δὲ τοῦτῳ ὑποδυνακεκα-
 θαιμώσδους
 τῆς σαρκὸς εἰσδὺς ἡσηνυσθοίων
 20 θέρμα δ’ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἦν.
 ὁ πρέσβυς οὕτως οὐκ ἔσωσε τὸν παῖδα
 μέλλοντα θνήσκειν. ταῦτα τλήθι γενναίως
 καὶ μὴ σοφίζον· τὸ χρεὼν γὰρ οὐ φεύξει.

Locum foede depravatam, in quo diductis litteris significavi verba corrupta aut suspecta, sic corrigere conatus sum :

- καὶ δὴ ποτε στὰς τοῦ λέοντος οὐ πόρρω
 κάκιστε [θηρῶν, εἶπε φάς,] σὺ τὸν ψεύστην
 ὄνειρον [ἄλλως] ὄμμασιν πατρὸς δείξας
 15 ἔχεις με φρουρὰ πε[ριβα]λὼν γυναικεία.
 τί δ’ ἡ πύω λόγοισι κοῦκ ἔργον ποίω; (!)
 τοίχῳ δ’ ἐπέβαλε τὸν λέοντα σιφλώσων.
 σκόλοψ δὲ τοῦτῳ (!) σὺν ὁδύναις καθ’
 αἰμώσδους
 τῆς σαρκὸς εἰσδὺς σῆψιν ἡνυσ’
 ἔμποιων (!)
 20 θέρμα δ’ ἀπ’ (ἵπ’ ?) αὐτὸν ἢ [γαγ’ ἐκ
 βίον θάττον ?].

Vs. 13] non male van Leeuwen *κάκιστον*, εἶπε, *θηρίον*, sed si re vera *κακείστε* est in tabella, alio opus est supplemento. Praefero tamen meo supplemento id quod Polak (qui in sequenti *Mnemosynes* fasciculo de his fabulis scribet), mecum communicavit : *κάκιστε* [, φησί, *θηρίων*] κ.τ.έ., quod ipsa simplicitate commendatur. Eidem debetur

quod versui proximo intuli supplementum. Furiae paraphrasis : τὸ ὄναρ—ὁ αὐτὸς *ἑώρακεν ἐν ὕπνῳ* μ.ά.τ.η.ν, unde non praeferendum arbitror [μάτην] ὄνειρον κ.τ.λ. Vs. 17] τυφλώσων pro ἀφανίων accipi posse vix credo. In idem se incidisse mihi scripsit Polak. Vs. 18] τοῦτῳ, scil. τῷ παιδί, usurpatum pro αὐτῷ suspectum. Cogitavi de τούτου, sc. τοῦ τοίχου, sed aegre careo pueri significatione. αἰμώδους proleptice dictum esse vix est quod moneam. Vs. 19] Hesselting dederat *εἰσδύσης ἦνυσε ποίων*. Ceterum quod e.g. dedi dubitationi valde obnoxium esse me non latet, nam et accentus in voce tradita ποίων pugnat cum metro Babriano et parum respondet paraphrasis Bodleiana *ἄλγῃμα ὁδὺ καὶ φλεγμονὴν μέχρι βομβώνων ἐιργάσατο*. Prior quidem difficultas tolleretur coniectura π[λ]είσ[τον] ἦνυσ(εν) πύων, sed altera restat. Accentus premit etiam ποίω vs. 16 et ἱμῶν fab. v, 9. Vs. 20] De forma *θήρμα* pro *θήρμη* consuleretur Lobeck *ad Phrynichum* p. 331. Reliqua correctio incerta. Paraphr. Bodl. habet *πυρετός τε ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀνάσας τὸν παῖδα θάττον τοῦ βίου ὑπέξήγαγεν*. De sequentibus plane satisfaciet Polak meus, cuius sagacitati imprimis commendo vs. 16 et 19, de quibus ipse despero. Mediocriter enim placet quod praeterea venit in mentem τί δὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ λόγοισι κοῦκ ἔργῳ (οἰς ?) θύω; i.e. *μαίνομαι*. Nihil ibi auxilii est in paraphrasi *ἀ τί δέ σοι ἐγὼ ἄρτι ποιήσω;*

In fabula *ἑλαφος καὶ κυνηγέται* (tab. vii. *init.*)

τὸν δ’ οἱ πόδες μὲν οἷς τὸ πρόσθεν ἠθύμει
 διέσωζον ὥς δ’ ἦλθεν εἰς μέσας ὕλας,
 ὄζοις τὰ κέρατα συμπλακέϊς ἐθρεύθη κ.τ.έ.

recte improbat van Leeuwen Hesseltingii coniecturam ὥς δ’ ἦλθεν. Equidem nihil melius reperio quam ὥς δ’ εἰσῆλθεν.

H. VAN HERWERDEN.

Scribebam Traiecti ad Rh.
 Calendis April. 1894.

PLAUTUS *CAPT.* v. 851.

Horaeum scombrum et trugonum et cetum et mollem caseum?

MR. HALLIDIE, in his recent edition of the play in Macmillan's Classical Series (London and New York, 1891), comments thus: 'ὥραιος applied to fish properly means "in season" (Soph. *Fr.* 446) and ὥρ. τάριχος = "fish pickled in season," i.e. when at their best. In Latin the word does not occur elsewhere; its proper meaning "in season" is out of place here and it is generally translated "pickled," but there seems to be no instance of its meaning this in Greek. Ussing takes it to mean "qui uere, τῆς ὥρας, uenit," i.e. "spring-mackerel," but the epithet would be superfluous if the season were spring and absurd if it were not. Possibly it means "young," cf. Ar. *Eq.* 1008, περὶ σκόμβρων νέων.' Weise, also, in his *Die Griechischen Wörter im Latein*, p. 121, says:—'Nach der Art des Präparats erhielten diese eingesalzenen Fische verschiedene Namen, je nachdem sie mager oder fett, in grossen oder kleinen Stücken, halb oder ganz mariniert wurden. Zur mageren Sorte gehörte das von Plautus *Capt.* 851 erwähnte *horaeum* = ὥραιον sc. τάριχος, d. h. das zur rechten Zeit, nämlich im Frühjahr, von jungen Thunfischen bereitete.'

It seems to me, however, that the commentators on this passage have wasted their efforts in trying to find a remote allusion. The natural meaning of *horaeum* would be 'of the season,' i.e. 'fresh'; and that is, I believe, the meaning here; for—

1. The fact that τάριχος ὥραιον occurs in Alex. *Ποιητ.* 1, 5, meaning pickled fish is no proof that τάριχος is to be supplied here.

2. ὥραια πηλαγὺς = 'tunny of the season' apparently in Soph. *Fr.* 446.

3. If the tunny was commonly pickled, it would lend point to the speech of the parasite here for him to specify that as a particular delicacy in this case the fish was to be fresh.

4. As the parasite is here making a show of his extreme hunger and his extravagant desires, he would quite naturally mention a very large fresh fish, such as at Rome so notoriously often graced the great feasts of the wealthy, rather than the smaller young fish which are said to have been used for pickling in the spring. This is especially probable from the connexion in the rest of the verse, as both the other two species mentioned are wont to grow to a great size in the Mediterranean.

KARL P. HARRINGTON.

University of North Carolina.

PLAUTUS, *STICHUS* 700.

MR. W. M. LINDSAY'S correction of *amica* in the beginning of this verse to *mica* is most brilliant and, to me at least, convincing; I should, however, write *Iam mica* or *mica tu*. A reference to the new edition of the *Dictionary of Antiquities (Micare digitis)* will supply many instances where this guessing at the number of fingers held up was equivalent to drawing of lots. In the 713th verse—*bibe, tibicen: age si quid agis*:

bibendum hercle hoc est; ne nega—I suggest that the difficulty may arise from *hercle* which is possibly a mistake for *helce*, i.e. ἔλακε 'toss it off.' This scene is full of Greek. The line might have run:

Bibe, tibicen: âge si quid, agis: bibedum: ἔλακε hocst! nó nega.

or *hoc sis.*

ARTHUR PALMER.

PROPERTIANA.

II. 10, 21—24.

Ut caput in magnis ubi non est tangere
signis

Ponitur hic imos ante corona pedes;

Sic nos nunc, inopes laudis conscendere
carmen,

Pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus.

Currum and *culmen* are well-known suggestions for *carmen* and either would do very well if the only task proposed were to find a noun which would suit *conscendere*. But it is also necessary to make the idea harmonize with a metaphor in the pentameter. And I think the key is supplied by Horace's words: 'Te nihil attinet Tentare multa caede bidentium Parvos coronantem marino Rore deos fragilique myrto.' Propertius says: 'I cannot offer meat sacrifices, only cheap frankincense.' *Carnem* will be an easy change from *carmen*: and the distich may be thus written:

Sic nos nunc inopes lautis conscendere
carnem,

Pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus.

'Too poor to cut up flesh with expensive rites': *sacris* being supplied from the second verse.

Lautis has been proposed but not with this construction: *ludis conscindere tauros* has also been suggested.

III. 10, 21.

Sit mensae ratio, noxque inter pocula currat,

Et crocino naris aureus ungat onyx.

Night should not come just yet (vs. 30).

Read:

nosque inter pocula currant.

'Let our cups go swiftly round.'

III. 20, 22.

Non habet ultores nox vigila deos.

Read *vigilata*, not *vigilanda*.

III. 18, 24.

Scandenda est troci publica cymba senis.

Troci N. *troci* D.V.: *torvi* vulgo.

Perhaps *Orci*. Propertius may have identified Orcus with Charon (Gloss. Philox.: *Orcus*, *Charon*): if not, *senis* may be changed perhaps to *semel*, if *senis* is too irreverent an epithet for Orcus, i.e. Dis.

IV. 4, 13.

Murus erant montes: ubi nunc est curia
saepta,

Bellicus ex illo fonte bibebat equus.

I propose the following arrangement:—

Murus erant montes: ubi nunc est curia,
saepta;

Bellicus ex illo fonte bibebat equus.

'Where the senate house stands now,
there were cattle-pens.'

III. 21, 25.

Illic vel studiis animum emendare Platonis

Incipiam aut hortis, docte Epicure, tuis.

Persequar aut studium linguae Demosthenis
arma.

Vel has been changed to *aut* by Müller, the sequence *vel—aut* being solecistic. *Studiis* is not in itself likely, is not coordinate with *hortis*, and gives offence owing to *studium* recurring so soon. Hence Broukhusius has changed it to *stadiis* or *spatiis*. *Stadiis* has found acceptance with Bährens, but is unlikely, as a Greek word, if for no other reason. *Spatiis* is no doubt possible. But how does *vel* come to be in all the good MSS.? Perhaps Propertius wrote:

Illic vestibulis animum emendare Platonis
Incipiam.

Vestibula might mean the porticos in the Academus. It would of course be more suitable to the Porch of the Stoics: and I would not deny that Propertius might have been thinking of them.

A. PALMER.

NOTES ON VERGIL.

Verg. *G.* ii. 77, and *G.* iii. 189.

(a) 'Udoque docent inolescere libro.'

(b) 'Etiam inscius aevi.'

Modern commentators seem doubtful about the meaning of 'udo' and 'inscius

aevi' in these passages. However that may be, it seems clear that Symmachus the orator took the words as simply applying to youthful vigour. At least he makes use of the passages in extolling the early elevation of Gratian to the throne. I will quote the passage at length as interesting if not

instructive. 'Et meherecule tenacius rapit inperii disciplinas teneritudo primaeva: virtus, cum cito inchoat, diutius perseverat. nempe *virentibus ramis* artifex rusticandi alienum germen includit, ut novella prae-segmina coagulo libri *uvidioris* (?) inolescant. audio in edomandis equis *aevi*, ut ait [vates], *inscios* aptius essedis colla subiun[gere].'
Laud. in Grat. ch. 6 (Seeck p. 331). (*uvidioris* is Kiessling's reading for the MS. *ubidiovis*.)

Verg. *Ecl.* iv. 46.

(c) *Talia saecula suis dixerunt currite fuis* Concordes Parcae.

The same speech (ch. 9) shows that Symmachus did not regard '*Talia saecula*' as vocative, as some moderns and Servius have done, whatever his view of the accusative may be: 'Et vere, si fas est praesagio futura conicere, iamdudum *aureum saeculum currunt fusa* Parcarum' (*Laud. in Grat.* ch. 9, Seeck p. 332). W. C. F. WALTERS.

HENRI ESTIENNE.

PROFESSOR ENGLAND has done well to defend Henri Estienne from the charges brought against him by Prof. Tyrrell and Dr. Sandys. Had they been better acquainted with that great man's life and character, they would, I feel sure, never have brought them. Prof. England has perhaps forgotten that a similar accusation used to be current against Estienne's edition of Plutarch, until recently it was disproved by Sintenis, who showed that every one of Estienne's conjectures could be traced to some MS. or other. Estienne, like all the

other editors of his time, did not give references to the authorities for his readings, but he was quite incapable of inventing readings.

In conclusion, why do Englishmen persist in calling him by that absurd name 'Henry Stephens'?

ARTHUR TILLEY.

[A reply from Professor Tyrrell to Professor England's article has been received too late for publication in this number, and will appear in July.]

SCHULZE'S EDITION OF BAEHRENS' CATULLUS.

Catulli Veronensis liber, recensuit Aemilius Baehrens. noua editio a K. P. SCHULZE curata. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1893. Pp. lxxvi, 127. 4 Mk.

THE first edition of Baehrens' Catullus, which now that the second has appeared will fetch fancy prices, was in the rigour of the term an epoch-making work. But it exhibited a text of the author much corrupted by unprovoked or unlikely or incredible conjecture; so that the task of revision was delicate, and the choice of a reviser was not easy. It was not easy; but scholars who are acquainted with the history of Catullus' text and with the metres he wrote in, who know how to edit a book and how to collate a manuscript, who are capable of coherent reasoning or at all events of consecutive thought, exist; and to such a scholar the task might have been allotted.

It has been allotted to Mr. Schulze, who says, '*Munus nouae huius libelli editionis post praematuram Aemilii Baehrensii mortem curandae ita suscepi, ut quoad fieri posset quam plurima eorum, quae ille ad Catulli carmina et recensenda et emendanda contulisset, retinerem ac seruarem.*' Out of Baehrens' conjectures Mr. Schulze has found it possible to retain six. The first of these is the merely orthographical correction 2 6 *libet* for *libet* or *iubet*. Two more are specimens of Baehrens' most despicable trifling: 6 9 *heic et illeic*¹ for *hec et illo*, as if forsooth that were a less and not a greater change than the old *hic et ille*; and 21 13 *nei* for *nec* instead of the usual *ne*, as if *nec* were not a perpetual corruption of *ne* in the MSS. of authors who never wrote *nei* in their lives. The three others, 68 139 *con-cipit*, 100 6 *egregie est*, 111 2 *ex nimis*, are

¹ The text has *illei*, whether from a misprint or from an improvement of Mr. Schulze's.

somewhat above the low average of Baehrens' conjectures.

But the emendations which place Baehrens next to Haupt among the post-Lachmannian correctors of Catullus are the things which Mr. Schulze has not found it possible to retain. Take for shortness' sake the 64th poem only. I will not be unreasonable and complain that Mr. Schulze omits Baehrens' correction of v. 73 *illa ex tempestate ferox quo tempore*; because I know that Mr. Schulze has never seen or heard of that correction. It occurs in Baehrens' commentary, and Mr. Schulze has not read Baehrens' commentary. That I affirm securely: if you ask 'whence then did Mr. Schulze learn (p. 97) that Baehrens had proposed *prompta* at 68 39?' I reply that he learnt it from Schwabe's edition of 1886; and if you ask 'how does he know (p. v) that Baehrens abandoned in the commentary some of his earlier conjectures?' I reply that he knows it from Iwan Mueller's *Jahresbericht*. For if he had read the commentary he would not merely know that Baehrens abandoned some conjectures but he would know which those conjectures are; and he does not. He still represents Baehrens as proposing *quacumueis* at 64 109, though Baehrens in the commentary said 'quam formam minime latinam non debui olim exemplis male fidis deceptus recipere.' And this barbarous and repudiated depravation, and the frivolous *heic* at 269, are all of Baehrens that Mr. Schulze finds it possible even to mention within the 400 verses of the 64th poem. The transposition of 216 and 217, *nascente* in 275, *incultum cano...* *crinem* in 350, *residens* in 387, *Amarunsia* in 395,—these may be found at least recorded in the editions of other scholars, but not in this book which bears on its front 'recensuit Aemilius Baehrens.' The transposition is accepted both by Riese and by Postgate, the emendation of 350 by Riese Postgate and Schwabe, the emendation of 387 is approved by Schwabe and accepted by Riese and Schmidt: but no vestige of these corrections survives in the monument reared to their author's memory by the Oedipodean piety of Mr. Schulze.¹

Baehrens' are not the only emendations which Mr. Schulze finds it impossible to retain or even to record. Which is the finest correction ever made in Catullus I will not undertake to say; but one of the first half-dozen is Froelich's 'non est sana puella nec rogare | qualis sit solet *aes* [et MSS.] *imagnosum*,'

¹ 'Tam bene de poeta suo meruit, ut dignus sit, cuius memoria pie colatur,' p. v.

which Baehrens of course accepted. Mr. Schulze ousts it for 'nec *rogate* | qualis sit: *solide est imaginosa*.' But no reader is likely to waste a glance on these Berlin goods if Froelich's restoration is left glittering in the apparatus criticus; so Mr. Schulze does not leave it there: he suppresses it. *Quaecumque adeo possunt afferre pudorem*, says Ovid, *illa tegi caeca condita nocte decet*.

One clue Mr. Schulze appears to possess: if he sees the name of Lachmann he follows it, 'errabunda regens tenui uestigia filo.' I say advisedly *the name*. At 63 5 he expels the emendations of Auantius and Bergk and writes 'deuolsit *ile*': it is not sense, but it is Lachmann's. A still more pleasing instance of simple faith occurs at 63 74 where Mr. Schulze reads with Lachmann 'roseis ut huic labellis sonitus abiit *celer*.' Lachmann himself, 'uir egregius' as Haupt calls him 'et multo quam imbecilli capiunt maior,' had a reason for adding *celer*: his theory of the pagination of the archetype made this verse the 18th line on the 41st page, while the 18th line on the 39th page was 'aliena quae petentes velut exules loca *celeri*,' whence he took the hypermetrical word to repair the deficiency here. But Mr. Schulze does not hold Lachmann's theory, for on p. lxiv he retains a note of Baehrens' which says 'tota ista numerorum singularum in V paginarum paginarumque uersuum computatio a Lachmanno instituta et ab Hauptio [quaest. Cat. p. 39-49; op. I 28 sq.] multis defensa ad nihilum recidit'; nor is it through inadvertence that he retains this note, for he has taken the trouble to write 'ab Hauptio' where Baehrens wrote 'a Hauptio' and to add the reference to the opuscula. He has abandoned then the basis of Lachmann's conjecture, but to the conjecture he adheres; and why not? its merit is not that he thinks it has a basis but that he knows it is Lachmann's. Again, when Lachmann has emended a passage, Mr. Schulze allows no one to improve Lachmann's emendation, because he does not know whether the improvement is an improvement and he does know that it is not Lachmann's. At 66 58 the MSS. have '*gratia* Canopieis incolae litoribus,' Lachmann emended *Graia*, and Baehrens improved this to *Graia*, which Lachmann of course would have adopted, as any one can see who turns to his note on Lucr. i 477 or remembers, as Haupt says, 'quotiens ex antiquae scribendi consuetudinis recordatione maxime Lachmannus in Catulli carminibus fructum cepit.' But no painting of

the lily for Mr. Schulze, who ejects *Graia* and replaces *Graia* in the text. I do not know all the salutations with which his idol will hereafter welcome him to Elysium, nor durst I write them down if I did; but from what happened to Eichstaedt and Forbiger I can tell that *mancipium* and *simius* are two of them. At the end of the note however Mr. Schulze ventures on a suggestion of his own: 'fortasse *grata*.' It is news then to this editor of Catullus that for 300 years no text was printed with any other reading than *grata*: history for him begins with 1829: he supposes Scaliger and Heinsius and Bentley and the rest of them went on content with *gratia* till Lachmann came upon earth to tell mankind that it was a trisyllable.

This brings us to Mr. Schulze's own emendations. One of these, *monendum est* for *monendum est* at 39 9, is no worse than the *monendum te est* and *monendus es* of others, so that the odds against it are only two to one. Then in several places he writes *uoster* where the MSS. are divided between *uester* and *noster*. Catullus may of course have used that form, but this divergency of the MSS. affords not the slightest ground for thinking that he did: *uoster* and *noster* are interchanged not in his text only, but in all authors whose MSS. are medieval; and they are interchanged not because those authors wrote *uoster* but from the cause exhibited in Mr. Schulze's own note at 71 3: 'urm VM: nrm g.' At 10 25 *sqq.* Mr. Schulze punctuates 'quaeso, inquit, mihi, mi Catulle, paulum | istos: comoda nam uolo ad Serapim | deferri,' but omits to say whether this means 'I wish my emoluments to be carried to Serapis' or 'I wish to be carried to Serapis in an obliging frame of mind.' Finally he emends 29 20 thus:

hunc Galliae timent, timet Britannia.

Two metrical solecisms in one line.

Baehrens' spelling, which was bad, Mr. Schulze has corrected as well as he knows how. He knows how to spell *sicine neququam* and *condicio*; so these words are rightly spelt. He does not know how to spell *umidus iucundus sodalicium* or *multa*; these words therefore retain their Baehrensian forms.

Baehrens' apparatus criticus was, as usual, a model of lucidity and order. Take a few examples of what it now is. At 68 140 the text has 'noscens omniului plurima furta louis,' where 'furta' is an old and generally accepted correction for the 'facta' of the

MSS. An editor who knows his trade expresses this fact by writing 'furta *uulgo*, facta V.' Mr. Schulze's note is 'plurima facta VM plurima furta *uulgo*': to occupy the printer he writes 'plurima' twice where it ought not to be written at all; to delay the reader he puts the note wrong end foremost. At 113 2 is a still wilder scene: text, 'Maeciliam: facto consule nunc iterum': note of a competent workman, 'Maeciliam *Lachmannus*, Mecilia G, Mecilia O, Maecilia *uulgo*, Mucillam *Pleitnerus*': note of Mr. Schulze, 'Mecilia OM Mecilia G | facto VM | Maecilia: facto *uulgo* Maeciliam: facto *Lachmannus* Mucillam: facto *Pleitnerus*.' Another revelation of the amateur encounters us in such places as 64 386: the text is 'saepe pater diuum templo in fulgente reuisens,' which is the MS. reading, so that of course there should be no note at all unless some conjecture is to be mentioned: Mr. Schulze writes 'reuisens VM.' Why not 'saepe VM, pater VM, diuum VM, templo VM, in VM, fulgente VM'? Elsewhere Mr. Schulze's ignorance of how things are done and inability to learn have made his notes completely unintelligible, and a reader who wants to know what the MSS. give must consult another edition. Take 61 46 *sq.*: text, 'quis deus magis est ama- | tis petendus amantibus': note, 'amatis VM magis a magis *Scaliger* anxiiis *Hauptius* magis est ama-tis *Bergk*': problem, what is the MS. reading? From other editions you learn that it is 'magis amatis est.' These are the sights which may now be seen in what was once the apparatus criticus of Baehrens: for appropriate comments I refer the reader to *Cic. Phil.* ii c. 41.

Now for the prolegomena. The prolegomena, I need not say, were the kernel of Baehrens' edition. In them he demonstrated, what no one suspected before but every one acknowledges now, that the Oxoniensis (O) and the Sangermanensis (G) are the authorities on which the text of Catullus rests. All that is now in dispute is whether the other MSS. are quite useless, as Baehrens held, or only almost useless, as his opponents hold. His prolegomena are thus the chief landmark in the criticism of Catullus' MSS., and there were two reasons why they should have been kept intact: their intrinsic merit, and their historical interest. Errors they may contain; and Bentley's Horace and Lachmann's Lucretius contain errors, but Mr. Schulze has not yet been invited to revise those works.

Baehrens held that G and O are the only

copies ever made of the lost archetype V, and that the other MSS. (ς) are all derived from G. His disputation ran as follows. When G and O disagree, ς almost always side with G; and they side with it not only in corruptions but in false conjectures which its corrector has introduced and which they cannot have got from any ancient MS.: therefore ς are derived from G. On the other hand all ς, or nearly all, often agree in one reading when G and O agree in another: therefore ς, except perhaps the Datanus, are not derived straight from G but from an apograph of G containing conjectures. The few instances where ς agree with O against G are partly due to true conjectures in this apograph, partly, where the difference is very minute, to accident: the Santenianus (L) has marginal readings taken from O, but whether O was ever transcribed entire he doubts. Where G and O and ς all three differ, the reading of ς is conjectural. As to the Datanus (D), which has at least one interpolation from Thomas Seneca, none of its readings (*postquam*, *demostrares*, etc.) are necessarily genuine but may be sham-antique: sometimes, like almost all other MSS., it gives better readings than GO, but these are conjectures: it is so interpolated that he does not trouble to decide whether it comes straight from G or through the same apograph as the others, for from G it comes: else why does it agree with G in error where O preserves the truth, and why, above all, does it reproduce almost every reading of G's corrector? questions which also apply to the rest of ς. He then discusses the marginal variants found in G: these must have been in the archetype because the scribe of G says he had only one exemplar: many of them appear in ς, which shows that they had most of them been copied into the apograph of G from which ς are derived.

Baehrens' arguments are now expunged, and in their place stands printed matter composed by Mr. Schulze. He sets out to demonstrate that all our MSS. come from a single codex, and fills more than two pages with passages which prove, or do not prove (the very first is 'I 5 *est pro es* codd. omnes *sinceri*' where of course '*sinceri*' just begs the question), what might have been proved in two lines: I notice that this form of exercise is now much in vogue with amateurs who wish to be critics and think this is the way. The archetype, he holds, was four times transcribed: one transcript is O, another G: 'librorum OG praestantiam magnus numerus locorum ostendit, quibus

soli [my italics] ueram lectionem aut certe meliorem quam ceteri omnes [mine again] codices praebent.' The list begins 'I 9 *quod* OG ς plerique: *quidem* ς complures,' and contains '42 22 *nobis* OG ς plerique: *nobis* ς pauci' and '61 100 *uolet* OG ς plerique: *nolet* D, *nolet* AL': Mr. Schulze is proving what is indisputably true and denied by nobody, and yonder is how he proves it. Then follow a number of places where ς agree with g (i.e. the corrector of G) in opposition to OG, and then (p. xliii) these incredible words: 'uel hac re eorum opinio refutatur, qui, ut Baehrensius et qui eum secuti sunt, omnes ς ex G fluxisse opinentur. nam cum codd. ς saepe cum G facere supra uideremus, qua re illi ut ς ex G descriptos esse putarent inducti sunt, hic non minorem numerum locorum congressimus, quibus ς cum g consentiunt.' And pray what is g? simply the corrector of G: the fact then that ς agree with the corrections found in G proves that Baehrens was wrong in supposing ς to be derived from G! This is no malevolent fiction of mine: it is what Mr. Schulze has written and Messrs. Teubner printed. But in the next sentence Mr. Schulze faintly remembers what g is, so he says that if the corrections in G are derived, as he holds, from some lost copy of the archetype, 'manifestum est fieri potuisse ut etiam ς non ex G, sed ex eodem illo codice correcto fluerent': *fieri potuisse!* so evaporates our refutation of Baehrens. 'Atque adeo g ς inter se conspirant, ut ex eodem codice interpolato descripti esse uideantur': yes, and Abraham and Isaac were so much alike that they appear to have been brothers.

Next we have places where ς agree with OG against g; then 'OG ς saepius contra G facere uidemus,' and of this 'frequent' phenomenon five examples are given, one of which is an example where it happens, and four of which are examples where it does not happen; then passages where D and the rest of ς desert G and agree with O are quoted, legitimately, though in stupefying disorder, to prove that ς are not derived from G. Some of these are places where G is wrong and ς are right, on which Mr. Schulze remarks (p. xlvii) 'qua in re ut sane concedendum est facile fuisse librariis uitia illa corrigere, ita mirum est, quamuis sescenties in transcribendis corruptelis scribas summa religione uti uideamus, illas a *cunctis* [Mr. Schulze's italics] felicissime esse correctas.' *Cunctis!* why, who ever dreamed of maintaining that each of the scribes made these corrections for himself? Baehrens, as

I have related, held that ϵ were all derived from a single apograph of G, and that all corrections common to all ϵ were derived from that apograph. But because Messrs. Teubner allow Mr. Schulze to maul Baehrens' work out of all recognition, he appears to think that he can with equal ease obliterate it from human memory. Then passages are quoted where ϵ have the reading which by comparing O we infer to have been G's original reading now erased by the corrector g. All these examples of ϵ agreeing with O against G are of course valid *prima facie* objections to Baehrens' theory. Baehrens' answer was 'talía, si falsa sunt, mero casui adtribuas: sin recta, aut casui aut Italorum ingenio.' This perhaps is not plausible; but on the other hand Mr. Schulze has no ground for concluding 'praeter duo illa apographa codicis V, G et O, tertium sumendum est, ex quo deriuati sunt g ϵ , uel potius, cum inter hos quoque D quidem et qui cum eo consentiunt et M insignem obtinere locum uideamus, quartum.' All readings which ϵ share with O they may have derived from O.

But in order to prove that ϵ are authorities independent of O and G Mr. Schulze now quotes a page and a half of readings from ϵ which he thinks better than O's and G's. They are all obvious conjectures, except one which is an exploded corruption, one in which he misreports the MSS., one which is probably interpolated from Quintilian, and the following two: '65 16 *Batiadae* ϵ *bactiade* B ϵ *pauci*: *actiade* O, *acclade* G. 66 5 *sub Latmia*] *sublamia* B: *sublamina* O, *sublimia* G ϵ *plerique*.' But *bactiade* may be a conjecture, as that was one of the many ways they spelt this name in the 15th century; and *sublamia* may be no more than a corruption of *sublamina*. Therefore Mr. Schulze is mistaken in saying 'nonnulla ea habent expressae sinceritatis signa, ut facere non possumus quin eis fidem habeamus.' Against the view that the good readings in ϵ are conjectures he has this notable argument: 'nemo quidem credit, eundem correctorem, quem aliis locis hominem indoctum cognouimus, hic illic mira sagacitate optimas correcturas suo ingenio inuenisse.' *Eundem correctorem!* Remember that on p. xlvii it suited him to assume that readings common to all ϵ must, if conjectures, have been made by each scribe for himself: now, when for instance at 64 120 he finds one MS. and one only giving *praeoptaret*, and giving it merely in the margin, he assumes that this reading must, if a conjecture, have been

made by the scribe of the common archetype of all ϵ .

Then we deal particularly with the two MSS. which Mr. Schulze regards as holding an 'insignem locum' among ϵ . First D, which 'ceteris codicibus hisce praestat locis': the places are 23 in number (and in several of them, since the list is of Mr. Schulze's making, other MSS. read just the same as D), some of them obvious conjectures, some bad corruptions, one probably interpolated from Seneca, one in which Mr. Schulze contradicts his own apparatus criticus, and these two,—1 2 *arrida*, 25 11 *insula*, the latter of which is worth something if it is really in the MS.; but these two readings are not found in D by other collators and rest on the testimony of Mr. Schulze; and if any one, after hearing what I shall shortly say about M, chooses to accept Mr. Schulze's testimony, let him. Then follow passages, proving nothing, where D 'optima tradidit' in company with OG or O or ϵ ; then our old friends the 'priscæ uerborum formae' which are no doubt D's most plausible feature; but Mr. Schulze has drawn up the list, so it contains eleven which are also found in G or O or both: it is true that what he set out to prove was that D is not derived from O or G but from a separate apograph of V; but that was some pages back, so he has forgotten it. Lastly, crown of glory, 'uersum 65 9 *paene solus tradidit*,' *alloquar audiero numquam tua loquentem*. Then are duly enumerated D's faults, its blunders and interpolations, among the latter 68 47 *omnibus et truiis vulgetur fabula passim*, which would do D even greater credit than *alloquar audiero* but for the mischance that we know it was written by Thomas Seneca.

'Neque minus insignem locum inter ϵ codex M tenere mihi uidetur, qui et ipse magnum numerum bonarum lectionum praebet': this is the Venetus excerpted by Ellis. There follow two pages of these 'bonae lectiones,' many of which of course are bad (one of them is 68 50 where M has the false *alii* and the right reading *Alli* is in O!), while of those which are not bad only one is peculiar to M. True, the reader would never guess this, for Mr. Schulze only notes the agreement of other MSS. in about a third of his examples, and leaves you to draw the false inference that in the other two thirds, where he does not note their agreement, they do not agree: in another writer this suppression of facts would argue fraud, but no such hypothesis is necessary in the case of Mr. Schulze,

Not one of the readings quoted has any sign of genuineness. But 'accedunt priscae formae': e.g. *Bithynia*, *Phrygii*, *coetus*, *labyrinthis*, *cachinni*! Others of these are not peculiar to M but found also in O or G or both or ϵ : the reader has guessed, before I tell him, that Mr. Schulze sometimes states this fact and sometimes conceals it. Others contradict his apparatus criticus, as 23 1 *seruos*. *Neptunus* at 31 3 and *antemne* at 64 234 are not the readings of M but merely Mr. Schulze's interpretation of its readings: it has *neptūnus* and *antēne*, which are identical with the *neptunus* and *antenne* of other MSS. 'Etiam in his lectionibus complures sunt quas non ingenio scribae deberi manifestum est, ut'—then one of Mr. Schulze's lists, comprising for instance 76 18 *extrema*, which is undisguisedly a conjectural accommodation of G's and O's *extremo* to the gender of *morte*; and 25 5 *oscitantes*, which is in G, so that Mr. Schulze need not be at all afraid of our imputing it 'ingenio scribae.' These readings, he placidly continues, are confirmed by the fact that most of them are found in other MSS. (such is the 'insignis locus' occupied by M), 'whence we may readily infer that the good readings peculiar to M are also derived from V.' On this logic it is the less necessary to comment, because there are only two good readings peculiar to M. They are *thuniam* for *thimiam* at 31 5 and *hinsidias* for *insidias* at 84 2. And these two—does my reader flatter himself that he has lost by this time the power to wonder at anything? I promise to amaze him now—these two readings, the only two good readings peculiar to M which Mr. Schulze can find, are not in M at all. They are figments of Mr. Schulze's. A facsimile of M has been issued by Count Nigra and may be seen at the British Museum: the handwriting is beautifully clear and the ink is beautifully black; and M gives *thimiam* and *insidias* just like any other MS. We see then that Mr. Schulze the collator is in no way inferior to Mr. Schulze the critic, Mr. Schulze the metrist, and Mr. Schulze the logician. And with such a collation of such a MS. has Mr. Schulze sullied Baehrens' apparatus criticus from end to end. Worse: whereas he says that M is derived from V, he exhibits it throughout as an independent authority, and you find 'arido VM' at 1 2 and you find 'dabis VM' at 116 8 and you find 'VM' on every page between.

Last comes the question of marginal variants in the archetype. Mr. Schulze has taken Baehrens' list of the variants in G,

and has mixed up with it all the variants he can find in ϵ and especially in his precious M; and he, who has himself collated that codex, has done so without discovering what is patent to every one who sets eyes on the facsimile, that nine tenths of its variants are from a later hand. It is clear, he then proceeds to say, that these variants found their way into M and ϵ not from G but from some other MS.: 'nam cum G octoginta omnino praebeat atque inde ab c. lxxvii nullas, M 155 per totum librum Catullianum aequaliter distributas habet.' If you say you have three sons at a school where there are 100 boys, Mr. Schulze will ask whether you are the father of the remaining 97, and if you disclaim the honour he will tell you that in that case you cannot really be the father of the three. But he has another argument: 'quodsi omnes ϵ ex G descripti essent, ponendum est singulares codicum O, M, B, L, aliorum duplices lectiones a scribis horum librorum fictas esse; id quod uel propterea fieri non potest, quod multae earum in textu aliorum extant codicum.' First, observe the ratiocination: because many of the variants in OMBL etc. are found in the text of other codices, therefore the variants in OMBL etc. which are not found in the text of other codices cannot have been invented by the scribes of OMBL etc. Secondly, it is not true that the hypothesis which derives ϵ from G compels us to suppose that these marginal variants have been invented by the scribes of the MSS. in whose margins they occur: what one naturally supposes is that the variants in the margins of MBL etc. (I do not know what O is doing here, nor does Mr. Schulze) have been taken from those other MSS. in whose texts they occur; and this is what Mr. Schulze must disprove before he will persuade any one that these variants come from the archetype. But he cannot disprove it: all he can do is to say 'nam si [30 9] in B *inde* al *idem*, in GDL *inde*, in O *idem* legitur, quis dubitet, quin in communi archetypo, codice V, duplex illa scriptura fuerit?' That V had the ditto-graphy is possible, since O has one reading and G the other; but B proves nothing unless Mr. Schulze can show that it did not get its *inde* from G and its *idem* from O. He however, as if he had proved his point, sails away with 'iam cum M et B neque ex O neque ex G fluxisse certum sit.....' and concludes 'itaque ea quoque, quae de uariis lectionibus codicum Catullianorum exposuimus, etiam codices deteriores quos uocant in recensendis poetae carminibus adhibendos

esse aperte docent.' Yes, and if I had been in Venice a week before Mr. Schulze and had scribbled conjectures of my own in the margin of M while the librarian's back was turned, Mr. Schulze, who cannot tell one handwriting from another, would have copied them all into his list, and they would now adorn pp. liv—lix of his prolegomena,

and he would be maintaining that M got them from the archetype.

Such are the contents of a book which carries on its title-page the name of Aemilius Baehrens and the monogram of B. G. Teubner.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

JEBB'S GROWTH AND INFLUENCE OF CLASSICAL GREEK POETRY.

The Growth and Influence of Classical Greek Poetry. By R. C. JEBB, Litt. D., M.P. Macmillan and Co. 1893. Pp. xvi. 290. 7s. net.

PROFESSOR JEBB has published in this volume the course of eight lectures on the poetry of Ancient Greece which he delivered in 1892 at the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore. Beginning with a brief sketch of the rise of Greek civilization, he proceeds to discuss the early epic as it appears in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the Hesiodic poems, the lyric, with a special lecture on Pindar, and the Attic drama, concluding with an essay on the permanent power of Greek poetry.

The foundation upon which the course of lectures was delivered is a Lectureship of Poetry, and the subject is dealt with in no narrow or scholastic spirit. That one of the first of living scholars should address himself to a popular exposition, in so clear and simple a form as this, of the principles and masterpieces of Greek poetry, is a sign of the times no less interesting than welcome. The study of Greek in the old sense is on its trial as an important part of humane education; it seems certain that within a few years it will cease to be any necessary part of the best type of school or college course. Those who believe that this change is a change for the better rest their case largely on the broad distinction between scholarship as a means, a set of gymnastic exercises for certain faculties, and scholarship as an end only worth following for itself. The compulsory study of Greek is not so much being forced out or argued down as melting away, but the study of Greek for the mere love of it is making extraordinary advance: perhaps it is not going too far to say that Greek has never been studied so much as now, nor on the whole so well.

And indeed it is when a distinguished scholar steps out of the charmed circle and in some such way as this communicates his results to a larger public than that of scholars, that he puts his own achievement to one of its highest tests. That there is a sense in which the technique of scholarship, like the technique of all acquirements, is an end in itself, an 'energy' in the Aristotelian sense, no one would deny. But it is an energy subordinate and ancillary in its nature, and if pushed higher only develops into pedantry. Scholarship as an end in itself is not a technique, but a spirit; its ultimate value to its possessor no less than to the world at large may be measured by the extent and force of its effect on the whole of life. The power of simple, true, and melodious expression is one of the first ways in which this effect should manifest itself. A life spent among the masterpieces of literature has been somehow spent wrongly if they have not saturated the scholar with something of their own virtue.

But further, it is in such popular treatment of the classics as these lectures supply that even more certainly than in commentaries or technical discussions the distinction is clear between the really fine scholar and the scholar who is only of the second order. The one thing is after all very much a matter of industry, of verifying references, where you can continually approximate to exactness by merely taking pains enough, and even the pastime of conjectural emendation is a game played by strict rule. But to put in intelligible language the exact truth about a Greek author, or about any aspect of the Greek life and spirit, is a work not only of acquirement but of genius. There is perhaps no subject in the world where the inexact truth is so easy to reach; none certainly where, when reached,

it is so useless and so worse than useless. To praise Professor Jebb's scholarship has long been superfluous, and in any case would come ill from one who is little better than an amateur; to say that his book stands this other test is praise neither superfluous nor slight.

That these lectures satisfy this test in varying degrees is of course inevitable. There are some parts of Greek literature—their earlier lyric poetry is a notable instance—where the exact truth is unattainable from mere want of documents; and the same is perhaps to some extent true—though the missing documents here are not manuscripts—of the Greek drama. It is not then surprising that the chapters on Homer and on Pindar should stand out very prominently from the rest of the book. It would be impossible to improve upon the sketch here given in the small compass of some fifty pages, of the spirit and substance of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. One may specially note the careful and discriminating comparison of the Homeric epic and the French *Chansons de Geste*; the extremely fine passage on the characters of Achilles and Odysseus; and that on the social position of women in the world of the *Odyssey*, with the two remarks, so curiously illuminative, on the use of the word *μήτορας* in *Odyssey* vi. 136 and on the popular version of the meeting between Odysseus and Nausicaa current in Corfu at the present day. Not less admirable is the short essay on the Hesiodic epics with which this chapter concludes; in the contrast between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* on the one hand and these poems on the other the author has, without forcing the note, skilfully conveyed the curious way in which Homer is at once Greek and not Greek with an exactly true value; for, as he points out, the Homeric epic as we possess it was created by the instinct of the Asiatic Ionians, and the manner of the *Works and Days* was in a sense more purely Greek. Modern criticism is perhaps too apt to gloss over the fact that Homer and Hesiod were habitually bracketed, as it were, by the Greeks themselves; and if as we follow down the history of Greek literature we keep hold in our mind of what one might call the Hesiodic tradition, much of what is difficult otherwise will be a good deal more intelligible, and the hard dry manner which meets us (and sometimes repels us) in much of the Attic drama, or in the prose of Xenophon and the Orators, will take its natural place, alongside of such a phenomenon as their excessive admiration

of Sparta, as part of the curiously narrow ideal of the average Greek *bourgeoisie*; a type far from being either romantic or heroic in its combination of the precisian without moral fervour and the man of the world who never could succeed in being a gentleman.

In the chapter on Pindar Professor Jebb is on ground that he has made peculiarly his own. The description of Olympia at the great festival is extraordinarily vivid and appreciative; and in the masterly analysis of the First Olympian, no less than in the general remarks which follow on the poet's movement and manner, it is 'from out the ghost of Pindar in him' that the criticism comes. Let one brief passage on the Pindaric diction, a model of fine and succinct expression, stand as a specimen of the insight and lucidity which inform the whole:—

'Particular notice is due to the stamp of his diction. Other great poets have been distinguished by more delicate felicity, more chastened beauty of phrase, more faultless and unimpeachable taste. Sappho and Simonides, to take only lyric examples, exhibit even in the few fragments that remain certain charms of this kind which Pindar lacks; but there is one gift in which he is absolutely alone. It is one which could find full scope only within the grand framework of the Dorian choral lyric,—the faculty of shaping magnificent phrases and giving them exactly their right setting in the spacious verse, so that they at once delight the ear and charm the imagination.'

Pindar, fortunately, perhaps for himself, is too difficult for use as a schoolbook, and the ground about him is not so clogged with masses of obsolete criticism as it is in the case of his great Athenian contemporary. There is no form of Greek poetry of which we know so much as we do of the Attic drama; 'it is,' says Professor Jebb, 'that which we can hope to see most nearly from the Hellenic point of view'; yet there is no form of Greek poetry of which our knowledge is, on the whole, more confused and ineffective. 'Modern criticism,' he says, 'has pondered particular sayings of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides; it has brought these sayings together, arranged them under heads, digested them into formulas, linked them by ingenious reconciliations, until for each of the three dramatists, it has evolved a certain body of philosophy or theosophy. Such efforts,' he hastily adds, 'have an interest and a value of their own.' Is he

so sure that they have? or did he shrink from breaking with the traditions of the lecture-room? At all events, the inevitable rubric *Ethical and Religious Views of Sophocles* follows in the margin in due course: and in a good deal of this chapter the author seems to be writing without ease, and even with a certain loss of grace. That *Welcker distinguishes two kinds of trilogy used by Aeschylus* may be what Professor Jebb's audience wished and expected to hear; it is not quite what one wishes he had told them. Does it matter, is it really relevant to the growth and influence of classical Greek poetry, what Welcker distinguishes?

In the eighth or concluding lecture, on the Permanent Power of Greek Poetry, Professor Jebb reaches what is really the most difficult part of his task. The importance of the exact truth becomes here more vital than ever, and any criticism more useless that is dictated by some standard of supposed critical orthodoxy. It is thoroughly satisfactory to find that in the temper and lucidity of his observations Professor Jebb is not hampered by any such dictation, though here and there he adopts a tone towards current conventions that may seem almost needlessly deferential. The antithesis between 'Hebraism' and 'Hellenism,' so light-heartedly laid down by Matthew Arnold forty years ago, was even then only a brilliant and stimulating paradox; with the advance of years it has lost most of its stimulating force and nearly all its gloss. The marriage of Faust and Helena is a piece of imaginative scholasticism which only shows how carefully scholasticism should keep clear of imagination if it does not wish to make itself ridiculous. One of Professor Jebb's predecessors in the chair of Greek at Glasgow published a treatise on Greek syntax with a preface upholding the study of Greek as the true safeguard of orthodoxy in religion and politics, and the bulwark against Jacobinism and atheism. We may smile at this now; we can hardly afford to smile at the phrase *Hebraism versus Hellenism* while scholars and critics continue to repeat it with such imperturbable gravity. Yet this celebrated antithesis was founded on what is really a dexterous confusion of language, and neither logically nor historically will it bear examination. It expressed with added piquancy the supposed antithesis of art and morality, doing so on the large assumption that Greek art does not convey moral ideas and that Hebrew literature is not a form of art. So too with

the specious contrast between classical and mediaeval art as though the two represented opposing forces. One of the chief triumphs of modern scholarship—and one for which it may be forgiven many shortcomings—is that it has worked out the proof line by line of what could before be only held as a matter of instinct and belief, that mediaeval art is the direct and legitimate descendant of Greek art, and that the two speak a mutually intelligible language: nor need we cavil if this capital result has been reached mainly by the irregular troops of the army while its solid phalaxes remained drawn up against a line of phantoms. In the history of art there are many periods; every great invention—the dactylic hexameter, the brick arch, the use of oil as a medium for pigments—divides in a sense the art before it from the art after; but before and after, the art is essentially the same. I remember hearing the captain of the famous Oxford Eleven of 1884 remark, when talk was running on the great variety of Mr. Spofforth's bowling, that he really bowled only two sorts of balls, those that were on the wicket and those that were not. There are and always have been two sorts of art; but these are not classical and mediaeval; they are good art and bad. The classics may serve in a way as a touchstone of pseudo-mediaevalism, as the great mediaeval art does of pseudo-classicism. But here too the world moves on. No one of moderate intelligence would now repeat the incredible conduct of Goethe at Assisi; nor has it yet, I suppose, been retaliated by Mr. Schultz or Professor Ramsay visiting Athens and refusing to go to see the Parthenon.

From such contracted views Professor Jebb is as far removed by the temper of his mind as by the width of his knowledge. No more just and appreciative statement could be made of the actual permanent value of Greek poetry than is made in the following words with which these lectures conclude:

'The claims of classical Greek poetry to a permanent hold upon the attention of the civilized world are of two kinds, intrinsic and historical. Viewed in regard to its intrinsic qualities, this poetry is the creation of a people in whom the gifts of the artist were more harmoniously united than in any other race; it bears the impress of their mind in the perfection of its form; it is also the spontaneous and profoundly suggestive expression of their life and thought. Viewed historically, this poetry is the fountain-head of poetical tradition in

Europe; it has supplied the typical standards of form, it has also furnished a varied wealth of material and illustration; even where it has not given a direct model it has operated by the subtle diffusion of an animating spirit; it has become blended with various other influences of later origin, and to every such alliance it has contributed some intellectual distinction which no other element could have supplied. So far from being adverse to those religious and ethical influences which are beyond the compass of its own gift to modern life, it is, rightly understood, in concord with them, inasmuch as it tends to elevate and to refine the human spirit by the contemplation of beauty in its noblest and purest form. On the high places of Greek literature, those who are worn with the troubles or disturbed by the mental maladies of modern civilization can breathe an atmosphere which, like that of Greece itself, has the freshness of the mountains and the sea. But the loneliness of Oeta or Cithaeron is not there; we have around us, on those summits, also the cheerful sympathies of human life, the pleasant greetings of the kindly human voice. The great poets of ancient Hellas recall to one's mind the

words in which Aeschylus described the kinsmen of Niobe who worshipped their ancestral deity on the mountain-heights of Mysia:—

The seed of gods,
Men near to Zeus; for whom on Ida
burns,
High in clear air, the altar of their Sire,
Nor hath their race yet lost the blood
divine.

Humanity cannot afford to lose out of its inheritance any part of the best work which has been done for it in the past. All that is most beautiful and most instructive in Greek achievement is our permanent possession; one which can be enjoyed without detriment to those other studies which modern life demands; one which no lapse of time can make obsolete, and which no multiplication of modern interests can make superfluous. Each successive generation must learn from ancient Greece that which can be taught by her alone; and to assist, however little, in the transmission of her message is the best reward of a student.

J. W. MACKAIL.

SITTL'S EDITION OF FIRMICUS.

Julii Firmici Materni matheseos libri viii.
Primum recensuit CAROLUS SITTL. Pars I.
Libri 1—4. Teubner, bibliotheca scr. gr.
et lat. 1894. 2 Mk. 40 Pf.

THE editor truly says of this book, almost unknown to scholars owing to the scarcity of copies, what holds equally of a Greek book, treating also of a mock science, the *Oneirocritica* of Artemidorus,¹ 'silvam rerum et sententiarum memorabilium libri continent.' I myself watched the market for many years before I secured one of the old editions. Of late Bonnet, Jahn, Haupt, Chr. Kelber ('Anfang eines Wörterbuchs z. d. libri math. des Firmicus, 1883'), H. Dressel ('lexikalische Bemerkungen zu Firmicus Maternus, Zwickau, 1882') have bestowed pains on Firmicus. Usener, with his usual sagacity, has discovered fragments

of Sallust in the prologue, which have already found a place in Maurenbrecher's edition of the histories of that author.

It is to be hoped that some one will undertake a lexicon to Latin astrological writers, including not merely Manilius and Firmicus, but portions of the Clementine recognitions, and other writings bearing upon the subject.

The belief in the influence of the stars on human destiny has coloured modern languages to an extent of which we are scarcely conscious. Firmicus is represented to some degree in our current lexicons, but new words, or new senses of old words, have still to be gleaned from his pages.

Take a few specimens: *altitudo* ii 3 §§ 1 bis 2 bis 4 5. c. 8. 23 § 11. 27 § 21 bis. *cardo* ii c. 13. 27 § 23. *domicilium* ii 2 §§ 1 3 bis 5 6 7 9. 3 §§ 5 bis 7. *domina* ii 24 § 2. *dominus* ii 2 § 3 bis. 23 §§ 2 bis 11 bis. 24 §§ 1 4 5. 26 § 3. *domus* i 5 § 7. ii 2 § 8. 3 § 7. c. 8. 23 § 11. 27 §§ 24 quater 26 bis (also in Clem. recogn. ix 17 bis 21 f. 23 bis. 24 bis 32). *dodecatemorion*

¹ See Reichardt in comm. philol. Jenenses, v (1894) 109—152, who finds traces of Stoic teaching in Artemidorus; a glance at Rigault's notes will show how much antiquaries owe to a writer now little read.

ii c. 11. iii 2 § 27 bis. 5 § 42 bis 13 § 15 quinquies. *antiscia* ii praef. §§ 2 5 ter 6 c. 27 passim. *anaphora* ii tit. ad calc. c. 7. iv 10 § 5. *cataphora* iv 10 § 5. *chronocrator* ii 24 § 1. *benevolus* ii 23 § 2. 26 §§ 2 5. *malevolus* ii 26 §§ 2 5 (cf. *malevolentia* Macrobian. somn. i 19 § 20). *minutum* = $\frac{1}{60}$ pars = $\frac{1}{1800}$ signum ii c. 5. 6 § 1 bis. cf. *minutiarum brevitatem* i 4 § 2. *feminina* and *masculina signa* ii c. 2 (*Libra* e.g. is masculine, *Taurus* feminine). *respicio* ii 23 §§ 2 11. 27 §§ 18 19 20 22. *video* ii 27 §§ 18 bis 21 bis. *cacodaemon* ii 27 § 17 bis (cf. Clem. recogn. ix 17 f. 22 f.).

In Firmicus, as in Apuleius, we observe an enthusiastic devotion to the reformed paganism. See i 10 § 17 *Sol optime maxime, qui mediam caeli possides partem, mens mundi atque temperies, dux omnium atque princeps* cet. and the remarkable chapter (ii 27) on the life and conversation, sternly ascetic (§ 20 *si te rectum videndi votum ab omni scelerum liberavit invidia et si purgatum animum et memorem divini seminis geris, aggredere hoc opus*), which befits him who would read the secrets of the heavens. Firmicus is careful to remark that neither

astrologers nor soothsayers can foretell the future of empire (§ 7 *solus enim imperator stellarum non subiacet cursibus et solus est, in cuius fato stellae decernendi non habeant potestatem*).

Sittl seems to have done all that is possible to secure a pure text, but no ancient manuscript contains all the books, and gaps occur in all.

One obvious correction has escaped the editor.

iv 2 1 Si se Luna Saturni applicaverit stellae et crescens lumine ista se Saturno societate coniungat vel si ad Saturnum feratur, matri viduitatem et mulierum locorum dolores decernit.

Read *muliebrium locorum*; if confirmation be required, turn to iv 23 3 Luna cum Saturno in horoscopo si fuerit partiliter inventa, faciet primos nasci aut primos nutriri, sed matribus miserum pondus viduitatis imponit aut facit eas in templorum conversationibus detineri et ex necessariis aut muliebribus locis grave valetudinis discrimen indicit.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

WOHLRAB'S REPUBLIC OF PLATO.

Platon's Staat. Erstes Buch. Erklärt von MARTIN WOHLRAB. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1893. 60 Pf.

THE present edition of the first book of the *Republic* does not lay claim to anything beyond an elementary character. Questions of textual criticism are excluded, and the exegetical notes are for the most part brief and dogmatic, on the Aristotelian principle *δέ πιστεύειν τοῖς μανθάνοντας*. But within the limits which the editor has prescribed for himself the quality of the work is good, although one could have wished that some fresh light had been thrown on some of the more difficult sentences in what is in some respects one of the most puzzling books of the *Republic*.

The introduction, extending over sixteen pages, treats of the dramatis personae, the date of action, of the argument and purpose of the dialogue, and finally of the relation between the first and the remaining books of the treatise. Wohlrab is, as might have been anticipated, a believer in the structural unity of the *Republic*, the composition of

which he assigns to the last period of Plato's literary activity, relying mainly on the formal connexion between the *Republic* and the *Timaeus*. This is perhaps the best working hypothesis—*οὐκ ἐπιβασίς τε καὶ ὁρμή*—on which to begin the study of the *Republic*, but he will be an unusually *σκληρός τε καὶ ἀντίτυπος ἄνθρωπος* who can hold to it as he advances.

The text of Paris A in the *Republic* is (apart from a few clerical errors) so much better than most of the emendations which have often replaced it that one is (on grounds of principle) glad to find Wohlrab retaining it even where it is probably wrong. Thus in 328 C he keeps the *ἐλλείπεται* of A and II, although in view of *Theaet.* 188 A *ἄλλο γ' οὐδὲν λείπεται περὶ ἕκαστον πλὴν εἰδέναι ἢ μὴ εἰδέναι* it is more than probable that the *ἐν λείπεται* of Θ and a marginal corrector in A is right: in the extremely difficult passage 333 E, where (in spite of Boeckh in his *Kleine Schriften* iv. pp. 326 ff.) it requires a heart of iron to resist the emendation of Schneider (in general the most conservative of editors),

he retains the reading of **A** with the addition of *καί* before *ἐμποῦσαι* from **Π**² at the cost of converting into manifest nonsense the manifest sophistry which we must allow to Plato in this part of the argument: and in 335 **A** he retains *ἦ* before *ὥς* where it is not only ungrammatical (which is not the point) but too harsh a solecism for the refined conversational style of the *Republic*. On the other hand in one or two passages Wohlrab forsakes the MSS. with insufficient reason, as in 331 **D**, where the *οὐκοῦν*, *ἔφη*, *ἐγὼ ὁ Πολέμαρχος τῶν γε σῶν κληρονόμος*; is quite in harmony with Polemarchus' *προθυμία*, and perhaps in 343 **B**, where the use of *διανοεῖσθαι* may to a certain extent be compared with 470 **E**.

The explanatory notes are clear and

sensible, if somewhat slight. Wohlrab's explanation of the difficult *οἶον γε* (**A** has *τε*) *σὺ, ὃ φίλε* in 336 **E** is the same as Schneider's, and probably right, but requires support in the face of the doubts recently thrown on the text by Apelt, whose ingenious emendation *λοῦ, λοῦ, ὃ φίλε* (in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbuch* for 1891 p. 557) will hardly convince Platonic scholars. There are many passages in which one might differ from the editor's interpretation of his author, but enough has been said to show the general character of this edition. Readers of the *Republic* would have preferred if Wohlrab had done for the *Republic* what he has done for the *Theaetetus* and other dialogues — brought Stallbaum up to date.

J. ADAM.

DUPUIS' *THEON SMYRNAEUS*.

Théon de Smyrne. Exposition des connaissances mathématiques utiles pour la lecture de Platon traduite pour la première fois du Grec en Français. Par J. DUPUIS. Épilogue: Le Nombre de Platon (Mémoire Définitif). Paris: Hachette et Cie.

THIS is an elaborate and ambitious work, which is not likely to find many readers either among mathematicians or scholars. Besides a translation of the text, accompanied where necessary by diagrams, it contains a scholarly account of the material available for the formation of the text of Theo, various appendices on points of special interest, elaborate indices, and a treatise on the Number of Plato, the fifth which has proceeded from the pen of the indefatigable author. The translation (so far as the present reviewer can judge) is only fairly accurate. Thus on p. 3 'nous donnerons ici un sommaire et un abrégé des connaissances nécessaires et la tradition des théorèmes mathématique les plus utiles' is an incorrect rendering of 'κεφαλαιώδη καὶ σύντομον ποιησόμεθα τῶν ἀναγκαίων καὶ ὧν δεῖ μάλιστα τοῖς ἐντευξομένοις Πλάτωνι μαθηματικῶν παράδοσιν': on page 5 there is a more serious error in translating a quotation from the *Epinomis* (92 **B**), for an essential point of Platonic doctrine is ignored when *τὸν τοιοῦτόν φησιν ἐκ πολλῶν ἕνα γεγονότα εὐδαίμονα τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ σοφώτατον ἅμα καὶ μακάριον* is rendered by 's'il y en a un seul

qui soit tel (mathématicien), c'est celui-là qui sera favorisé de la fortune et au comble de la sagesse et de la félicité.' It would be easy to multiply such instances, but it is right to say that the exposition of the more properly mathematical part of Theo is probably more accurate.

The chief interest of the book however is in the appendix on the Number, apart from Dupuis' interest in which the translation would probably never have been executed. It is unfortunate that Theo in his otherwise meritorious dissertation has steered clear of the one serious and important mathematical *crux* in Plato. Such help as he gives is merely incidental and accessible in other sources, such as Nicomachus. Although it is easy to attack, or even to overthrow, the theory of Dupuis, it may be interesting to know the final conclusions which have been reached by so diligent an investigator in this fascinating field of inquiry. Dupuis abstains from any attempt to connect the Number with the argument of the *Republic* as a whole, and confines himself entirely to the mathematical side of the problem. Retaining the best authenticated text, that of Parisinus **A**, he interprets the passage (*Republic* 546 **B, C**) as follows. *θεῶν γεννητόν* denotes the stars: *ἀριθμὸς τέλειος* the great year. The *αἰξήσεις* *δυνάμεναι τε καὶ δυναστευόμεναι* ('producing and produced') he identifies with the Pythagorean *τετρακτὺς* 1, 2, 3, 4: this comprises (*λαβούσαι*)

the three ἀποστάσεις (2, $\frac{3}{2}$, $\frac{4}{3}$, the intervals of the octave, the fifth, and the fourth) and four ὅροι, which are αἰξόντων καὶ φθινόντων according to the order in which you take them, and ὁμοιούντων καὶ ἀνομοιούντων because two cords of equal tension give forth like sounds if one is twice the length of the other, and unlike sounds if the conditions are different. It will be observed that Dupuis does not regard the first section of the passage as expressing any single number at all. To come to the second. ὧν ἐπίτριστος πρῶτῃ is $\frac{4}{3}$, ὧν ('among which') having as its antecedent αἰξήσεις: πεμπάδι συζυγεί is 'plus 5.' This gives $\frac{19}{3}$. The words τρίς αἰξήσεις, according to Dupuis, denote three successive multiplications, but what the multipliers are has to be discovered from the sequel. In other words, the unknown

quantities of the equation (for such, in common with most recent writers on the subject, Dupuis believes the Number to be) are contained in τρίς. We thus reach $\frac{19}{3} \times xyz = \text{what?}$ The first harmony (according to Dupuis is $100 \times 100 = 10,000$: the second is (ισομήκη μὲν τῇ) $100 \times (4,800 + 2,700) = 100 \times 7,500 = 750,000$. Having reached this stage, Dupuis adds the harmonies together and pronounces the ἀριθμὸς γεωμετρικὸς to be 760,000. The equation $\frac{19}{3} \times xyz = 760,000$ is satisfied by interpreting x as 3, y as 4, and z as 10,000. Such is Dupuis' solution of the Number: those who have busied themselves with the subject, will be able to appreciate its value; those who have not, will not, and need not, care.

J. ADAM.

CORPUS GLOSSARIORUM LATINORUM III. V.

- Vol. III. *Hermeneumata pseudodositheana* edidit GEORGIUS GOETZ. Accedunt *Hermeneumata medicobotanica vetustiora*. Lips.: Teubner. 1892. 22 Mk.
Vol. V. *Placidus liber glossarum, glossaria reliqua*. Edidit GEORGIUS GOETZ. 1894. 22 Mk.

THE four volumes now published contain the bulk of the glosses thought to deserve publication. Supplements will be appended to vol. i, which is devoted to a general discussion of glosses and glossaries. Vols. vi vii, on which Goetz is now engaged, will contain a general glossary. In this the glosses will be critically revised; as yet the exact reproduction of the MSS. is all that has been aimed at. Hence it appears premature to suggest corrections, until the editor's final results are known. Already many valuable contributions have appeared from the pen, among others, of H. Nettleship; the latest, and not the least instructive, in the fifth volume of the 'Commentationes philologiae Jenenses'; (1) 'De Festo Pseudophiloxeni auctore scripsit Albertus Dammann,' pp. 1—48; (5) 'Hermeneumata Vaticana emendavit illustravit Immanuel David,' pp. 197—238. It is a pleasure to welcome the latter critic, who signs himself 'Lesbius.' Bryennios does not stand alone among the Greeks of today.

Sometimes doubts are expressed whether great scholars, as Scaliger, Lindenbrog,

Ruhnken, who devoted so much time to the correction of glosses, might not have been better employed; but no one will share the doubt who is acquainted with the progress of lexicography. Many words have found their way into the dictionary on the authority of a gloss, which later research has discovered in authors of name. For a long time to come this tracing of glosses to the rock from which they were hewn will afford interesting occupation to the student. I give three examples which I have lately noted.

Aug. enarrat. in ps. 139 12 a.m. bestiis subrexerunt. corp. gl. v 443 5 bestiis subrigi ad bestias mitti. Paucker spicileg. 163 seq. Vict. Vit. iii 27. Non. 50 2. Rönch in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1880, 379, 440. Rufin. h. e. (ed. Cacciari, Romae 1740, 4to) iv 15 p. 210: Proconsul dixit: bestias habeo paratas, quibus subrigeris, nisi cito paenitueris. vii 11 f. devorandi, inquit, bestiis subrigantur, where Cacciari reads *subigantur*, supposing that *subrigantur* of the printed copies is a misprint. viii 7 p. m. p. 476: iubentur alii vere criminosi bestiis subrigi. ix 6 p. igitur apud Tyrum Phoenicis urbem tres quidam iuvenes correpti cum se christianos esse confiterentur, bestiis subriguntur.

Aug. in ps. 66 10 p.m. renovabitur iuventus nostra sicut aquilae; tantummodo nos vetustatem nostram ad petram Christum conteramus...Sive illa vera sint, fratres,

quae dicuntur de serpente, vel quae dicuntur de aquila, sive sit fama potius hominum quam veritas... Tu esto talis, ut iuventus tua renovari possit sicut aquila. et scias eam non posse renovari, nisi vetustas tua in petra contrita fuerit. . . Tu ergo talis noli esse: sed esto talis quod contra invenis, id est, ut praeterita obliviscaris, in anteriora te extendas; ut vetustatem tuam in petra conteras. Here the mention of the serpent made me suspect that *vetustas* =

senecta or *senectus*, the 'slough,' but I was not fully assured till I found in corp. gl. v 621 30: *meratrum* est herba de qua comedunt serpentes et exuunt vetustatem.

Add to lexicons *conviciosus* Hier. in ps. 38 hom. 2 2. Aug. c. sec. resp. Iul. i 11. in ps. 21 enarr. 1 7. corp. gl. iv 325 10. Hildebrand gl. Paris. 429 p. 79. *conviciosa* Aug. serm. 126 8. c. Petil. iii 18. Acron on Hor. s. i 5 65.

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

VOLLMER ON PUBLIC FUNERALS AT ROME.

De funere publico Romanorum, scripsit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Commentatio ex supplemento undevicesimo Annalium Philologicorum seorsum expressa. 8vo. 319--364 pp. Leipzig: Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.

THIS is the first exhaustive treatise on the subject. A *funus publicum* was an official funeral, not one merely to which the public was invited, as Guhl and Koner (*Life of the Greeks and Romans*, p. 590 English translation) thought. It corresponds in many respects to the funeral of a United States Congressman, being at the public expense, costly, and stopping public business. Vollmer's treatment is lucid and logical.

§ 1 states the origin of the custom. The *funus collaticium* was paid for by voluntary contributions; such, for instance, were the funerals of Valerius Poplicola and Menenius Agrippa; other forms of the *collaticia* appearing in funerals the expenses of which were met by burial societies; and in the field the military funeral of the common soldiers paid from the *folles*. When the state paid the expenses through the quaestor, acting under the instructions of the consul, who was obeying a *senatus consultum* made for the purpose, then the *funus* became strictly *publicum*. The first Roman *funus publicum* positively known was that of Servius Sulpicius Rufus 711/43. Syphax and Perseus were buried at the expense of the state, but as guests of the commonwealth; their funerals were not properly *publica*. Vollmer gives a list of thirty-four *funera publica*, the last being Caracalla's 971/217. The custom survived into mediaeval and modern times.

§ 2 is a closer examination of the meaning of *funus publicum*; a state funeral expressed

the public sorrow. Toward the end of the Republic the state not only paid the expenses, but undertook the whole management of the funeral. This included the eulogy by a magistrate, often a place of burial, but never the erection of the monument itself—except in case of the emperors—nor any cult of *manes*.

§ 3. The decree was made by the senate, either independently, or at the suggestion of the emperor; and finally by the emperor alone, when the senate became a *nominis umbra*. The consuls executed the decree through the quaestors. The funerals were always *indicta*, and often accompanied by *ludi*.

§ 4. The order of the ceremonies was as follows: expositio corporis mortui (vel imaginis) in foro, contio totius populi praesentibus ordinibus senatorio et equestri virorum et mulierum, pompa militum, imaginum comitatio amplificata, laudatio a magistratu habita, portatio mortui per honoratos viros, agmen magistratum et pontificum, ludi magistratum et pontificum, ludi militares circa rogam, incensio rogi per magistratum. There was a *iusstitium* and mourning by the women for a year.

§ 5. It was decreed in honour of distinguished men; not for women until the time of Augustus, but afterwards to women of the emperor's family. In the municipia, at least, boys and young men were so honoured for the sake of their families.

§ 6. The cost is not easy to discover. Vespasian's funeral cost *sestertium centies*, but numbers are rarely given. *Decies* is stated in some Italic titles; at Surrentum HS c; at Pompeii HS ∞ ∞ for an aedile and *livi iuri dicundo*.

§ 7. In the *municipia* the custom was general. The oldest instance is the funeral

of the poet Lucilius 651/103. Sometimes the honour was accepted, and the money declined.

§ 8. *Funus censorium* = *amplissimum* = *imperatorium*. Contrary to the opinion of Nipperdey and Becker, the *funus censorium* was carried out by the consuls or *duoviri*. The expression dates from Augustus, who wished to be buried in a censor's robe.

§ 9. Documenta, 17 pages; chiefly from the *Corpus Inscriptionum*.

The article in the *Dictionary of Antiquities* follows Marquardt (*Privatleben*² i. 350 sq.) in regarding the funerals of Syphax and Perseus as *funera publica*; the f. censorium being the magistrate's funeral of highest grade; but Marquardt adds that the f. c. was not due to the censor's edict. Vollmer thinks the story about Valerius Poplicola is due to Valerius Antias and consequently

untrustworthy as far as any *vote* of the people is concerned; and, with reference to Menenius, he utterly discredits Dion. Hal. (6, 76). This is the weak part of the treatise, and we must regard the *funus publicum* and *collaticium* as still confused. Military funerals, both of privates and officers, were not necessarily *publica*; the *senatus consultum* is the decisive thing; often, as in the case of Hirtius and Pansa, the funeral was both *militare* and *publicum*. As to Syphax and Perseus, their funerals were in a sense public, but Vollmer is right in separating them from the ordinary class. The value of his treatise is conditioned by the importance of the subject; but at any rate the author seems to have exhausted the topic.

W. A. MERRILL.

Miami University, Ohio.

PRAECHTER'S TABULA OF CEBES.

Cebetis Tabula. Recensuit CAROLUS PRAECHTER. Lipsiae in Aedibus B. G. Teubneri. 1893. 60 Pf.

THIS little edition contains within brief compass the results of much industry and learning. A preface of eleven pages discusses the relationship of the MSS., in regard to which the editor substantially agrees with Müller, except that he refuses to consider the Vatican codex as the archetype of the second class of MSS. A full apparatus criticus accompanies the text, which is followed by a brief index of non-classical words and usages likely to furnish evidence as to the date of composition of the *Tabula*. A single point of interest may be referred to. In section 3 of chapter 26 it is said of the individual who has triumphed over 'the greatest beasts' (meaning Ignorance and Error and the like) οὐ μὴ διωχληθήσεται οὐδὲν οὔτε ὑπὸ Ὀδύνης... οὔτε ὑπὸ ἄλλου κακοῦ οὐδενός. ἀπάντων γὰρ κυριεύει καὶ ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστὶ τῶν πρό-

τερον αὐτὸν λυπούντων καθάπερ οἱ ἐχιόδηκτοι (so A, but Praechter adopts Casaubon's conjecture ἐχιοδεῖκται). τὰ γὰρ θηρία δήπον τὰ πάντας τοὺς ἄλλους κακοποιούντα μέχρι θανάτου ἐκείνους οὐ λυπεῖ διὰ τὸ ἔχειν ἀντιφάρμακον τοῦτο (for which οὔτω is read by Praechter after Schweighäuser). Praechter's note on this passage is as follows: 'An fuit apud veteres opinio eos qui serpentis morsui supervixissent, ab eius bestiae impetu immunes esse? Quod si testimoniis confirmetur, ut ἐχιόδηκτοι sic statim τοῦτο (ex ἐχιόδηκτοι intell. τὸ δεδῆχθαι) servari possit.' This suggested interpretation of the reading of the MSS. so plainly suits the whole context of the passage that it can hardly fail to be right. Mithridates is said to have fortified himself against poison by the abundant use of the homoeopathic method: can any one supply a specific illustration of a similar belief in regard to the bite of snakes?

J. ADAM.

FROEHDE ON DE NOMINE OF PROBUS.

Valerii Probi de nomine libellum Plinii Secundi doctrinam continere demonstratur. Scripsit OSCAR FROEHDE. Commentatio NO. LXX. VOL. VIII.

ex supplemento undevicesimo Annalium Philologicorum seorsum expressa. 8vo. Pp. 159-203. Leipzig: Teubner, 1892. M. 1, 20.

U

FROEHDE is well known by his work on Charisius, and in this monograph has made a strong case for the Plinian source of Probus' work. He shows first that the *libellus de nomine*, the authorship of which has heretofore been a matter of doubt, is really a work of Probus. The complete text of the work is printed in parallel columns with parts of Charisius; and from the agreement and disagreement, the common citation of texts, and some mistakes common to both, it seems highly probable that both drew from a common source; and as this source for Charisius is known to be

Pliny, the conclusion is that the original doctrine is contained in Pliny's 'dubii sermonis octo' referred to in the catalogue given by the younger Pliny *Ep.* 3, 5, 5. The contribution of J. W. Beck in the *Berliner Wochenschrift* 1892, Nos. 50 and 51, is also valuable, as showing that many Plinian fragments are concealed in the works of the grammarians, and that before many years it may be possible to reconstitute the book in a measure.

W. A. MERRILL.

Miami University, Ohio.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO LATIN LEXICOGRAPHY.

AMONG the necessary preliminaries of the great Latin *thesaurus* now in hand, are new texts and special lexicons. From the eighth volume of Wölfflin's *Archiv* I glean various particulars of interest. Few writers were already furnished with a better index than Sallust, but Bert. Maurenbrecher (*C. Sallusti Crispi historiarum reliquiae*. Lips. 1893) has superseded Dietsch by a fuller collection of fragments and a complete *index verborum*. The index to the *Optatus* of Car. Ziwsa (*corp. ser. eccl.* xxvi. Vindob. 1893) is full of matter for the grammarian and lexicographer. Caelius Aurelianus is an important witness for African Latin: a pupil of Bücheler's, Heinr. Friedel, has published *prolegomena* to a new edition (*De scriptis Caelii Aurelianiensis Methodici Siccensis*. 1892. 4to).

While Bishop Wordsworth and his colleagues have finished about one half of the vulgate N.T., others have devoted their attention to the Old Latin versions, on which many scattered labourers have been at work since Sabatier and Bianchini. Thus Joh. B. Ulrich published in 1893 a programme: 'De Salviani scripturae sacrae versionibus.' Ph. Thielmann, a well-known authority on the later Latinity, communicates to the eighth volume of the *Archiv* studies on the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. He thinks it impractical to attack the question of the Old Latin from its most difficult side, the gospels and Pauline epistles. By the help of the Bavarian Academy, having obtained collations of many mss., chiefly from Paris and Italy,

he announces a critical edition of *wisd. ecclus.* Judith, Esther, Tobit. Hugo Linke in Breslau proposes to begin an edition of the 'Itala' with two sections, (1) the Penta-teuch, (2) Joshua—2 Esdr.; he reports that the palimpsest Vindob. 17, first published by Belsheim, may shortly be expected in a trustworthy form.

Few fragments of grammar are more instructive than the Appendix Probi (Keil's *Gramm.* iv 197—9). Keil however contented himself with Endlicher's apparatus, but Prof. v. Hartel has photographed the text from ms. Vindob. 17 (cent. viii), and Wend. Förster (*Wiener Studien* xiv, 1892, 278—322, also separately issued) by the help of Bücheler, Usener, Zangemeister, Leo etc. has been able to restore the text in many places. Some Tironian notes still defy the most skilful decipherers.

P. Geyer (*Archiv* viii 469—481) finds traces of Gallic Latin in Marcellus Empiricus (in the critical edition of Helmaireich, Teubner, 1889).

Dr. Valentine Rose, known by his *Anecdota*, Cassius Felix, Vitruvius, etc., has undertaken to edit Theodore Priscian for the *bibliotheca Teubneriana*; an edition of '[Apuleius] de medicaminibus herbarum' is shortly expected. Lessing, who published '*Studien zu den Script. hist. Aug.* Berl. 1889,' has in hand a lexicon to these biographies. Maxim. Ihm adds a comprehensive index and commentary to the veterinary writer Pelagonius of Salona (cent. iv, *biblioth. Teubn.*).

JOHN E. B. MAYOR.

THE ORIGIN OF THE LORD'S SUPPER: A REPLY.

THE little essay in which I propounded my historic doubts as to the origin of the Lord's Supper, and submitted to the judgment of experts some new views on the subject, has called forth many criticisms expressed alike publicly and privately. As yet the views to which I inclined, of the Pauline origin of the Lord's Supper as an institution, and its connexion with Eleusis, have only been publicly accepted and defended by one eminent theologian, Professor Pfleiderer; but various reviewers, English and foreign, agree with the views of my paper up to a certain point. It is not however easy to stop short at a given point: this I tried, and only after three or four re-writings did I see how far it was necessary to go in order to avoid the gravest difficulties. On the whole I venture to say that my essay, put forth with professed diffidence, has stood fire better than could have been anticipated.

Perhaps the most decided rejection of my arguments is to be found in Mr. Mayor's criticism in the *Classical Review* of April. I am allowed by the courtesy of the editor to examine briefly that criticism. But the *Classical Review* is scarcely a suitable place for detailed controversy of a theologico-historical kind; I shall therefore use the privilege with great moderation, and do little more than reply to arguments which have already appeared in the pages of this *Review*.

I will not follow Mr. Mayor in the details of his grammatical argument as to the meaning of the phrase 1 Cor. xi. 23 ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. This has been matter of infinite controversy. Mr. Mayor, after Winer and other authorities, thinks that in the phrase it is implied that St. Paul received the institution from Christ not directly but through the Apostles or tradition. But this is denied by a host of authorities on the other side. To mention only one or two English theologians, Lightfoot (on *Gal.* i. 12) writes 'I do not think the distinction drawn by Winer and others between λαμβάνειν παρὰ Κυρίου and λαμβάνειν ἀπὸ Κυρίου (1 Cor. xi. 23), as denoting respectively direct and indirect communication, can be insisted on.' Alford more boldly says 'the distinction is fallacious: cf. e.g. 1 John i. 5.' Principal Edwards (*comm. ad loc.*) says 'Chrysostom, Calvin, Estius, Bengel, Osiander, Olshausen, Alford, Evans

&c. understand' (the phrase) 'to mean an immediate communication made by the risen Lord to the Apostle himself. It is the only interpretation of the words that adequately explains why the Apostle should mention the thing.'

I confess to some surprise that Mr. Mayor has treated the view that we have here to do with a direct revelation to St. Paul as if it were a new invention of mine, instead of a view maintained by a number of able critics. In so doing he seems to take the place of a controversialist rather than of a reviewer: and though the controversy is quite courteous it appears in what professes to be a review.

Mr. Mayor complains of my rendering ἐγὼ by 'I myself.' I took the rendering from Mr. W. J. Conybeare's excellent paraphrase, but of course it somewhat overshoots the mark. Yet ἐγὼ means more than the unemphatic 'I,' and I would submit that the use of ἐγὼ and the singular verb raises up a wall of distinction between the phrase above cited and that which Mr. Mayor would regard as a parallel to it, ἡ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν Μωσῆς. A tradition would naturally belong to *us*, the Jewish race; a revelation to *me* the seer. When in 1 Cor. xv. St. Paul is speaking of what he received from the Apostles, the words ἐγὼ and ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου are alike omitted.

Passing from the grammatical criticism of the Pauline phrase, let us consider the wider historical criticism. And here I think that Mr. Mayor's strictures may be more definitely met.

The statement of my essay that the formula of institution 'This do in remembrance of me' does not occur in the text of any Gospel, but is based only on the authority of St. Paul, rests on the critical decision of Westcott and Hort. Mr. Mayor is disposed to dispute that decision. 'Was it likely that St. Luke, the devoted friend and companion of St. Paul, should be ignorant of this account (in 1 Cor.) or could knowingly have passed it over in his Gospel?' Surely an argument of this kind can claim very little objective value. That the author of the Third Gospel was acquainted with the Corinthian Epistle, or at all events with the customs of the Pauline Churches, is more than likely. But that he was St. Luke is most doubtful, even most improbable. An argument in precisely the opposite direction

would be more legitimate: 'since the author of the Third Gospel omits words which are a prominent feature of the Pauline account of the Last Supper, he can scarcely have been one of the immediate followers of St. Paul.'

But, proceeds Mr. Mayor, 'does it follow that because' (the words of institution) 'are not recorded by the Evangelists, they were therefore not spoken by the Lord at the Last Supper?' And he goes on to cite instances in which events recorded by one Evangelist are omitted by another, and the like. This is true enough, but not in the present case an argument. What we are searching for is proof that the words in question were uttered before the Crucifixion. It is no proof at all to reply that although the Evangelists do not record the saying, yet it *might* have been uttered. Of course the Evangelists do not record one in a hundred of the sayings and doings of their Lord: yet they can only be witnesses for what they do record. And going by historical probabilities, it must be maintained that their evidence, so far as it goes, is against the institution of the Lord's Supper in the lifetime of the Founder of Christianity, as a rite to be observed in the future.

My essay called in question the existence of any evidence of the custom of the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, before it was introduced at Corinth by St. Paul. To this Mr. Mayor replies that the custom in the very early church is implied by the phrase *κλᾶσις ἁπρῶν*. But the force of this objection is removed by the very fact on which he dwells, that *κλᾶσις* is a sort of technical term for the broken bread used in the common meals mentioned in the *Didachē*. For in that document what is described is not the Lord's Supper of St. Paul and later Christendom, but a *εὐχαριστία*, which may indeed show something of sacramental character, and probably of Pauline influence (as I am ready to concede), but which is far nearer, as Harnack has pointed out, to the teaching of the Fourth Evangelist than to that of the Corinthian Epistle.

Another of my reviewers, Mr. A. Wright, in an able paper contributed to the *Churchman* (March, 1894) has dwelt on the same point, and seems to regard the breaking of bread as a custom peculiar to the Christian sacrament. His view is extreme. He observes that the phrase *breaking of bread* is 'never found in the Old Testament, nor, I believe, in any pre-Christian author.' 'It was our Lord who introduced a new custom.' This is however a mistake. In Isaiah lviii.

7 both Cheyne and Delitzsch read 'Is it not to break thy bread to the hungry?' And Benzing in his recent *Hebräische Archäologie*, p. 87, mentions the Jewish custom of breaking bread. It seems to have prevailed in sacrifices (cf. *Lev. ii. 6*) and especially in the funeral feasts (*Jer. xvi. 7 &c.*). As to its precise meaning in Jewish custom we may be doubtful. Certainly to share bread with another in the East constitutes a tie of fellowship with him. But there was much more in the Lord's Supper than a feast of Christian fellowship.

A word must be added as to the relation of the Fourth Evangelist to the Lord's Supper. Most of the critics have borne hard on my statement that this writer seems to intend in his sixth chapter to keep the mystic teaching there contained as regards the body and the blood of Christ apart from the historical tradition of the Last Supper. No doubt the Fourth Evangelist was acquainted with the custom of the Lord's Supper, as with the custom of baptism. He was not disposed to attach great value to rites as such. But as he mentions water in connexion with the new birth, he seems to have appreciated the Christian custom of baptism. On the other hand there is an entire absence of indication that he regarded the attachment of the mystic doctrine of the body and blood to the Christian Communion as desirable. And in describing the Last Supper he follows what seems to be a trustworthy tradition, and yet omits all reference to the founding of a Sacrament. No doubt argument from omission is always dangerous: but in this case it is of double strength and must be allowed some weight. It is far easier to account for the line taken in the Fourth Gospel if the Sacrament were of Pauline origin, and did not date from the Master's lifetime.

A wider historical question is raised when we consider how the ideas embodied in the Christian Sacrament are related to previous history, Jewish and Greek. It seems quite clear that the notion of communion with an unseen power, which is specially implied in the Lord's Supper as accepted by St. Paul and the Christian Church, existed in a lower and embryonic form in the Mysteries of the Heathen, and only required like most heathen beliefs to be raised to a higher sphere, and 'baptised into Christ,' to be fit for a nobler destiny. If the institution of the Lord's Supper was first introduced by St. Paul at Corinth, the probability of some influence of the neighbouring Eleusis can scarcely be overlooked. If it was first intro-

duced elsewhere, the mysteries of Mithras or Sabazius might seem a more probable source. But Mr. Mayor thinks of a purely Jewish origin. He asks 'Was it really necessary that a Jew should be brought in contact with Pagan ceremonial before he could realize the religious importance of commemorative festivals?' The reply is that the Christian Sacrament was far more than a commemorative festival. It implied a fellowship between worshipper and worshipped, a notion of primitive religion, the preservation and development of which was especially due to the more orgiastic forms of Greek religion, the Dionysiac Mithraic and Orphic cults. In origin these cults were not purely Greek: they brought into Greece ideas and feelings foreign to the purely Hellenic religion. And they had, as Dieterich has clearly shown in his *Nekyia*, a considerable influence on Jewish religion also between the time of Alexander and the Christian era. Doubtless St. Paul was a Jew, a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, but yet he was to an extent which he himself did not realize under the influence of those Hellenistic ways of thought which in those days a man could no more wholly escape than he could live without breathing. And the Orphic Mysticism in one of its many forms would influence him as it influenced Aeschylus and Polygnotus and Plato and the authors of the Book of Enoch and Philo. Mr. Wright in the paper already cited observes that 'the resemblance between the Christian ordinance and both ancestor-worship and the Eleusinian Mysteries is no doubt real, but I should account for it by the similarity which exists between all ancient religious rites among civilized peoples.' As a generality, this may well pass. But in considering the origin of a rite arising at a known time, and possibly a known place, we must try to go beyond generalities. And it has to be shown that in the middle of the first century A.D., in the Greater Greece of the Levant, any cults existed except those belonging to the Orphic stratum of ideas (using the word Orphic is quite a general sense) which were likely to give precedent for such a rite as St. Paul describes.

The Fathers of the Church had a keen hatred for the Pagan Mysteries, not so much, probably, because they contrasted with, as because they were like their own. *Simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis*. But we have changed our point of view. We look on the ape no longer as a caricature of man but as representing a stage in his

development. In the same way the Pagan Mysteries acquire interest and dignity when we realize that though they were tainted with formalism, imposture and even obscenity, yet they held the germs of ideas destined for a higher life under the influence of a nobler and purer religion.

PERCY GARDNER.

I AM reluctant to occupy any more of the space of the *Classical Review* with a discussion which scarcely falls within its province, but there are one or two points in Prof. Gardner's reply on which a word of explanation seems desirable.

ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου. The point to which I called attention in this phrase was the variation from the ordinary construction *παρέλαβον παρὰ*. I never denied that *παρὰ* may be used with the first link of a chain of tradition—on the contrary, I quoted an instance of it—but, as contrasted with *ἀπὸ*, the former suggests the closer, the latter the more distant connexion. I further pointed out, what I should think all must admit, the unnaturalness of the expression *παρέλαβον* for an apocalyptic vision; and lastly I said that St. Paul's appeal to the authority of other churches in the same Epistle, in confirmation of his own decision as regards the position of women, made it unlikely that he should have been here insisting on a tradition not accepted by other churches. I do not see that in my discussion of this point I have said anything which could imply that Prof. Gardner was propounding a novelty; not that this would be any reason for condemning it in my own mind: *non enim tam auctores in disputando quam rationis momenta quaerenda sunt*. Nor do I quite understand the distinction he draws between the controversialist and the reviewer. We may distinguish three kinds of useful reviews; the first states what is to be found in the book reviewed, without any attempt at criticism; the second adds to this the expression of the reviewer's judgment; the third adds likewise the reasons for his judgment. This last is to my mind by far the most profitable sort of review, provided that you have a competent and fair-minded reviewer; and this is what it was my aim to give in my notice of the *Origin of the Lord's Supper*.

The argument as to the probability that St. Luke would have included in his account of the institution of the Eucharist those particulars on which St. Paul had laid such stress, was of course addressed to readers

who, with Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort, believed the Third Gospel to be written by St. Luke. To those who, like Prof. Gardner, hold this 'to be most improbable,' the argument would have to be differently worded, but it would not I think lose its force, supposing that they admit the writer of the Acts to be the same person with the writer of the Gospel.

Lastly, I am not at all concerned to deny

that St. Paul may have found an interesting parallel to the Christian Sacrament in the Pagan Mysteries, and I should like to see this subject worked out more fully; at the same time it must not be forgotten that there was much in the details of the Mysteries, which would have been most abhorrent to Christian feeling.

J. B. MAYOR.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ATHENE ERGANE.

Βάρ' εἰς ὁδὸν δὴ πᾶς ὁ χειρῶναξ λεῶς
οἱ τὴν Διὸς γοργῶπιν Ἐργάνην στατοῖς
λίκνοισι προστρέπεσθε.

Soph. *Fr.* 724.

THIS passage has generally and no doubt rightly been brought into connexion with the festival of the Chalkeia celebrated by the craftsmen of Athens (the *χειρῶναξ λεῶς*) in honour of the master craftsmen Hephaistos and Athene Ergane. One element remains on this supposition unexplained. Why do the craftsmen worship their gods 'with winnowing baskets set up'—an element more appropriate surely to Demeter or Bacchus than to the 'operosa Minerva'?

Sophocles makes no mention of Hephaistos, and it is doubtful if *originally* the Chalkeia had anything to do with him. Suidas gives us some valuable information on this point. Χαλκεία ἑορτὴ ἀρχαία καὶ δημώδης πάλαι, ὕστερον δὲ ὑπὸ μόνων ἤγετο τεχνιτῶν ὅτε ὁ Ἡφαιστος ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ χαλκὸν εἰργάσατο, and again ἑορτὴ... ἃ τινες Ἀθήναια καλοῦσιν' οἱ δὲ Πάνδημον διὰ τὸ ὑπὸ πάντων ἄγεσθαι. We may I think dismiss the Hephaistos element as ὕστερον, but there still remains Athene the Workwoman and the problem why she demands the winnowing baskets.

The explanation is I think a simple one. The root of the words *ἔργον* and *Ἐργάνη* bears another and a more primitive meaning than that in later times usually implied. *Ἔργον* is a 'land' as well as the result of a craft and Ergane is she of the tilled ground as well as she of the needle and loom, the chisel and hammer. We need go no further than the *Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι* of Hesiod and the *ἀνδρῶν πίονα ἔργα* of Homer. This meaning is put second in the lexicon but surely

came first to primitive man. The 'works' of Ergane changed from ploughed fields to statues as her worshippers changed from rural labourers to city craftsmen and artists, but even *χειρῶναξ λεῶς* dare not omit from the cultus of Ergane her sacred symbol of the *λίκνον*: she would remember though they might forget.

Yet another curious point remains to be noted. Athene Ergane was figured in art as a Herm. If she were merely the goddess of craftsmen, it is not a little surprising they should have given the figure of their patroness so meagre a specimen of their skill. But for Ergane of the fields, possibly at first a mere landmark, no form could be more natural and appropriate. She was not alone in this simplicity. At Megalopolis Pausanias writes (viii. 32, 4) *εἰσὶ δὲ ἱποκαταβάντι ὀλίγον θεοὶ, παρέχονται δὲ καὶ οὗτοι σχῆμα τετράγωνον* Ἐργάται δὲ ἔστιν αὐτοῖς ἐπικλήσις Ἀθηνᾶ τε Ἐργάνη καὶ Ἀπόλλων Ἀγνείως. Here we have a whole collection of husbandry gods to whom later no doubt the names of particular Olympians were affixed. Agnieus, the primitive form of Apollo, was a husbandman before he became the Delphian, Ergane before she attained local splendour as Athene.

It has been noted by Prof. Robert (*Hermes* xxii. p. 135) that, as dedications to Athene Ergane are set up in the precinct of the Polias, Athene Ergane and Polias are probably identical; if so, there is no need to seek for a separate shrine of Ergane. It is to say the least noticeable that in the shrine of Athene-Polias-Ergane there is a *Ἐρμῆς ἑύλου*, very ancient—*Κέκροτος εἶναι λεγόμενον ἀνάθημα*—to which could we but add a *Σπουδαῖον Δαίμων* the much disputed Trinity of the lacuna passage (P. i. 24, 3) would stand complete.

Mr. Frazer (*J.H.S.* xiii. part ii. p. 1) in

his article on the pre-Persian temple on the Acropolis has shown incidentally that Polias was the mother goddess of the Erechtheion from whom the later Parthenos, originally but her other aspect, differentiated herself with ever increasing clearness. This Polias this Ergane was the Kouro-trophos, the mother of fruits to fields and man.¹

This brings us back to the Chalkeia and the *λίκνα* and enables us to formulate their function with somewhat more precision.

In an unpublished essay which he kindly allows me to cite Mr. A. G. Bather has shown, with I think a high measure of probability, that the Chalkeia was a ploughing festival closely analogous, as primitive ploughing festivals are, to marriage ceremonials. It was *ἐπὶ παιδὸν γνησίῳ ἀρότῳ* and included such elements as the familiar 'yoking of the maiden' and the sowing of seed mixed with the ashes from the plough fire. For the whole question of this primitive sympathetic magic which has left abundant trace in many a tragic metaphor I must refer to the chapter on 'Kind and Korn' in Mannhardt, *Mythologische Forschungen*, where this natural symbolism is traced to the wedding ceremonials of primitive peoples throughout the world. One point however must be noted in detail, i.e. the function of the *λίκνον*.

The Pseudo-Plutarch (*Prov. Alex.* xvi. 1255) states νόμος ἦν Ἀθήνησι ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ἀμφὶ βαλὴν παῖδα λίκνον βαστάζοντα ἄρτων πλέων εἶτα ἐπιλέγειν Ἐφύγον κακὸν εἶρον ἄμεινον—the loaves of bread are but the later more civilized form of the seed corn itself, and the seed was the symbol of the child. The new-born child itself was laid for luck in the liknon as its cradle. ἐν γὰρ λείκνοις, says the Scholiast to Callimachus *hymn* i. 48, τὸ παλαιὸν κατεκοίμζον τὰ βρέφη πλοῦτον καὶ καρποῦς οἰωνίζόμενοι. *λίκνον* οὖν τὸ κόσκινον ἢ τὸ κούνιον ἐν ᾧ τὰ παῖδια τιθέασιν, and again Servius commenting on the 'mystica vannus Iacchi' (*Georg.* i. 166) says: vannus

¹ Since writing the above it has occurred to me that, in the ceremonies of the Chalkeia (or some analogous Boeotian festival) may be found the true solution of the much discussed archaic plate in the British Museum B. 80 (for literature see Mr. Walters' catalogue, p. 76). Mr. Cecil Smith explains the obverse as a marriage procession, Mr. A. S. Murray as a sacrifice to Athene. A priestess presents to Athene an object that seems to me to be a *λίκνον*. May not the scene be explained by a quasi-joint solution—a marriage procession of Athene, i.e. the Chalkeia? On the reverse, the goat is sacrificed, the skin of which, the aegis, was carried to, and put on the newly married goddess or mortal to secure fertility. I throw out the suggestion, but its full discussion must be reserved for a future date.

autem apud eos *λίκνον* nuncupatur: ubi de more positus esse dicitur postquam est utero matris editus.

Athene Parthenos might shirk her motherhood and give the child to Gaia to rear up, but Polias-Ergane, yoked to the plough, lawful wife of the old Herm Ergates, did not disdain the service offered *στατοῖς λίκνοισι*.

JANE E. HARRISON.

THE HARBOURS OF CARTHAGE.

IN June 1891 I published an article on the Harbours of Carthage in the columns of this *Review*. And in October 1893 I replied here to the criticisms of Dr. Raimund Oehler in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* for 1893, pp. 321—332. I have now to reply to the criticisms of Dr. Otto Meltzer in Fleckeisen for 1894, pp. 49—68 and 119—136. It appears that Dr. Meltzer had sent his article to press before he heard of my reply to Dr. Oehler; but he has added a *Nachschrift* in rejoinder.

Dr. Meltzer upholds the orthodox theory. Southward of the citadel of Carthage there are two large ponds in the low ground between the hill and the shore. The northern pond was originally circular, with a circular island in the middle, and formed the harbour for the fleet. The southern pond was originally rectangular, and formed the mercantile harbour. There was a canal between the two harbours, and another from the mercantile harbour to the sea.

My theory is that the ponds have nothing whatever to do with the harbours. I am of opinion that the outer harbour was formed by piers in the sea; and also of opinion that the inner harbour was nearly surrounded by the outer harbour, but that its position is otherwise unknown.

In speaking of Carthage, Appian says that the harbour-mouth was not very far from the land, viii. 121, οὐ πᾶν πόρρω τῆς γῆς ὄντα, sc. τὸν ἑσπλουν τοῦ λιμένος. This implies that it was an appreciable distance from the land; and that would be impossible unless it lay between two piers. Dr. Meltzer replies, p. 119, *schliesslich erledigen sich freilich alle derartigen erwägungen von selbst durch den blick auf den zusammenhang, in welchem jene angabe steht: sie ist gemacht von dem standpunkte Scipios auf der landzunge aus, dem ausgangspunkte des damms, mit dem er den hafeneingang zu schliessen beabsichtigte, und in diesem sinne ist sie vollkommen zutreffend*. Appian simply says

that Scipio decided on blocking the harbour-mouth by throwing out a dam, and this was practicable because the harbour-mouth was not very far from the land; but Dr. Meltzer wants to make him say that it was not very far from a particular piece of land. Appian, however, has a particular name for this particular piece of land; and calls it by that name in the very next sentence. After saying that the harbour-mouth was οὐ πᾶν πόρῳ τῆς γῆς, he proceeds to say that Scipio threw out the dam ἀπὸ τῆς ταινίας, ἢ μεταξὺ τῆς λίμνης οὐσα καὶ τῆς θαλάσσης γλώσσα ἐκαλεῖτο. If he had only meant to say that the harbour-mouth was not very far from this piece of land, he would presumably have put ταινίας or γλώσσης in place of γῆς and altered the arrangement of the sentences. Moreover, on Dr. Meltzer's hypothesis, the harbour lay inland in a hollow with its mouth upon the shore at the point marked 42 in Falbe's map; and if Appian had wanted to say that this point upon the shore was not very far from another point upon the shore, he would never have used the word γῆ to denote one of these points in contradistinction to the other. And then again Appian says that Scipio carried the dam out seaward, προῖον ἐς τὸ πέλαγος καὶ εὐθύνων ἐπὶ τὸν ἑσπλόν: and that hardly sounds as though the dam was carried from one point upon the shore to another point upon the shore, according to Dr. Meltzer's theory.

Dr. Meltzer admits that the name of Cothon was given to the outer harbour. The name is interpreted by Festus, s.v., *Cothones appellantur portus in mari interiores, arte et manu facti*. And this interpretation is in favour of my theory; for if an artificial harbour is constructed in the sea, it must be formed by piers. In reference to this interpretation Dr. Meltzer says, p. 131, *charakteristisch für Torrs methode ist ihre verwerfung, um damit, dh. mit einer unrichtigen auffassung derselben, Vergilius und Servius vermeintlicher weise zu widerlegen. es genügt wohl dem gegenüber festzustellen, dass die worte des Festus die bedeutung haben konnten, Cothones seien künstliche, im binnenlande hergestellte seehäfen. dass sie diese auch haben sollten, mag dabei immerhin nur den wert einer vermutung behalten.* Dr. Meltzer has no ground for saying that I used the passage in Festus to refute the testimony of Virgil. I used it to refute the testimony of Servius; but not without other evidence to the same effect. Dr. Meltzer does not give his reasons for saying that my construction of the passage is erroneous. And perhaps

I may be permitted to doubt whether he has any reasons to give; for in the next sentence he commits himself to the proposition that the words *portus in mari interiores* may be represented by the words *seehäfen im binnenlande*. He must either make *in mari* mean *in terra*, or else take *interiores* as equivalent to *im binnenlande* and thus ignore *in mari* altogether. The word *seehäfen* does not give the force of *portus in mari*; for it only means that the sea is in the harbour, whereas the Latin means that the harbour is in the sea.

The name of Cothon was not given to any harbour away from Carthage except the harbour of Hadrumetum; and at Hadrumetum there was a harbour formed by piers, which are still in existence. This coincidence is in favour of my theory that the Cothon at Carthage was a harbour formed by piers. Dr. Meltzer replies, p. 55, *dabei ist jedoch übersehen, dass drinnen im lande an einer stelle, die sich freilich zur zeit noch nähern nachforschungen entzieht, die spuren eines zweiten, von menschenhand gegrabenen hafens sowie die spuren des canals nachweisbar sind, durch welchem derselbe mit dem äussern hafen in verbindung stand.* That is the orthodox statement; and I went down to Hadrumetum fully expecting to find these traces of an inner harbour. But I could not find anything of the sort; and I do not think I could have been mistaken. A man might overlook the remains of a monument, or even of a building; but he could hardly overlook the remains of so big a thing as a harbour, if such remains existed.

Dr. Meltzer supports his statement by references to H. Maltzan's 'Reise in den Regenschafften Tunis und Tripolis,' vol. iii. pp. 46 ff., and C. Tissot's 'Géographie comparée de la Province Romaine d'Afrique,' vol. ii. pp. 154 ff.; and then he adds *wem sie zu sehr unter dem einfluss von A. Daux zu stehen scheinen, dem wird doch die kurze bemerkung von G. Wilmanns im C.I.L. VIII. s. 15 genügen.* Wilmanns' remark runs thus:—'cum [Hadrumetum] tempore belli Caesariani et portum haberet et cothonem (bell. Afr. 62, 63), quorum certa vestigia in ora maris etiam nunc visuntur, saeculo tertio,' etc. This does not agree with the account that Maltzan and Tissot have received from the notorious Daux. According to Wilmanns, the vestiges of the inner harbour are by the shore: but Daux interposes a canal between the inner harbour and shore, and makes this canal more than 280 yards in length. Having seen the place myself, I am not prepared to

attach much weight to either story. I suspect that Daux and Wilmanns both went to Hadrumetum with the notion that a Cothon was necessarily a harbour that lay inland in an excavation; and thus were led to describe various ruins ashore as remnants of that harbour.

Be that as it may, Dr. Meltzer has not only got to prove that there was an inner harbour at Hadrumetum: he has also got to prove that this inner harbour was the Cothon. He says, p. 132, *hier konnte der ausdrück [Cothon] nur den innern, von menschenhand ausgegrabenen hafen bezeichnen, und die im b. Afr. 62, 63 geschilderten ereignisse lassen auch auf nichts anderes schliessen, als dass von diesem die rede ist, welche benennung der äussere, durch molen dem freien meere abgewonnene hafen von Hadrumetum geführt hat, ist dabei eine sache für sich.* Those statements will not bear examination. The two first passages are, 62, 'vigilia secunda Adrumeto ex cothone egressus cum primo mane Leptim universa classe vetus, etc.,' and, 63, 'promunturium superarunt atque Adrumetum in cothonem se universae contulerunt.' These passages simply state that the fleet left the Cothon at Hadrumetum to go to Leptis; and that, after it was driven back from Leptis, it returned to the Cothon at Hadrumetum. There is nothing in them to suggest that the Cothon lay inland in an excavation; or that the fleet started from an inner harbour and returned to an inner harbour. The remaining passage is, 63, 'navibus onerariis, quae erant extra cothonem, incensis omnibusque reliquis ab iis aut subductis aut in cothonem compulsis.' This passage simply states that, when Caesar came up from Leptis in pursuit, he burnt all the merchant-ships that were not either run ashore or taken into the Cothon. There is nothing here to suggest that the Cothon lay inland in an excavation; and clearly the Cothon cannot here be taken for the inner harbour. If Caesar had burnt all the merchant-ships that were not either run ashore or taken into the inner harbour, he must have burnt the shipping in the outer harbour: and the historian would never have omitted all mention of so important an incident as the capture of the outer harbour.

Dr. Meltzer asserts that the name of Cothon was given to the inner harbour at Carthage as well as the outer harbour. He says, p. 131, *dem wortsinne nach muss also der ausdrück κόθων die ganze hafenanlage von Karthago, den handelshafen und den kriegshafen, zusammen bezeichnet haben.* That

is contradicted by Appian, viii. 127, ὁ μὲν Σκιπίων ἐπεχείρει τῇ τε Βύρσῃ καὶ τῶν λιμένων τῷ καλουμένῳ Κόθωνι. If these words mean anything, they mean that one of the harbours was called the Cothon, and the other was not. Dr. Meltzer meets the objection by saying that Appian contradicts himself—p. 132, *Appians darstellung steht im widerspruch mit sich selbst.* There is no explicit statement of his grounds for this assertion, but he leaves no doubt of what they are. Appian speaks of τὸ μέρος τοῦ Κόθωνος τὸ τετράγωνον, and afterwards of τὸ περιφερὲς αὐτοῦ μέρος, and Dr. Meltzer takes these phrases respectively to mean the outer harbour and the inner harbour. But, obviously, this does not show that Appian contradicts himself: it only shows that he contradicts Dr. Meltzer's interpretation of him. My interpretation is that the Cothon was formed by piers which made an angle at one end of the harbour and a curve at the other, like the piers at Hadrumetum; and that Appian's phrases refer to the two ends of this harbour. That is in accordance with his statement, viii. 127, that the round part was ἐπὶ θάτερα τοῦ Κόθωνος from the square part. And from this point of view his narrative is plain and clear throughout.

According to Appian, viii. 127, the Romans finally took the city by capturing the wall round the Cothon; and they effected this by surprising the round part of the Cothon, while they were threatening the square part. My theory is that the round part was the northern end; and that the curved pier continued the curve of the hills that sweep round from the citadel to the little headland northward of the ponds. In this case the Romans could have attacked the round part from the north. Dr. Meltzer's theory is that the round part is represented by the northern pond. In that case the Romans could not have made their attack from the north, as the way was blocked by the defences on the hills. Accordingly, Dr. Meltzer has to say that they came up from the south-east, where they had established themselves in force upon the χῶμα, or wharf. He states this fully on pp. 129, 130, with references to Falbe's map. But this only removes the difficulty a step; for then there is the question how the Romans got at the wharf, if that lay to the south-east.

Dr. Meltzer supposes that this wharf is represented by some ruins in the sea just opposite the southern pond, and fixes the site by reference to the points marked 44

to 47 in Falbe's map. In that position the wharf would not have been accessible by land from any place except the city itself. But the Romans must have made their attack by land, for Appian says that they brought battering-rams to bear on the defences here, viii. 124. Dr. Meltzer has therefore to suppose that the Romans made their attack from the dam which Scipio threw out to block the harbour-mouth. Thus he says, p. 122, *sollte der damm die hafeneinfahrt wirklich versperren, so musste er auf das χῶμα hin gerichtet sein und dieses erreichen. er hat es bei der südspitze desselben erreicht*, &c., and then again, p. 54, *am folgenden morgen griff Scipio das χῶμα an, was eben nur von seinem damm aus geschehen konnte*. This is nothing but conjecture. In the first place, there is no evidence to show that the dam ran out towards the wharf. No doubt, it would have run towards the wharf, if the wharf were on the east side of the harbour-mouth: but that is simply an assumption. In the second place, there is no evidence to show that the dam ever was completed. The last that Appian tells us of the dam is that the work was making progress—viii. 121, *προϊόντος τοῦ ἔργου*—and then the Carthaginians cut a new mouth at the other end of the harbour, thereby defeating the object of the dam. In the third place, there is no evidence to show that the wharf was attacked from the dam. Appian gives a minute account of the attack, devoting two whole chapters to it, viii. 124, 125; but there is nothing there to indicate that the attack was made from the dam.

Dr. Meltzer here cites the passage in Plutarch, *apophthegmata regum*, p. 200, *ἐπεὶ δὲ παρελθὼν (Σκιπίων) εἰς τὸ τεῖχος, τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἐκ τῆς ἄκρας ἀμνομένων, τὴν διὰ μέσου θάλασσαν οὐ πᾶν βαθεῖαν οἶσαν τοῦ Πολυβίου συμβουλευόντος αὐτῷ κατασπεῖραι τριβόλους σιδηροῦς, κ.τ.λ.* He says, p. 123, *Scipio befindet sich auf seinem damm, am schauplatz jenes kampfes—das müssen die worte παρελθὼν εἰς τὸ τεῖχος besagen sollen*. The dam is nowhere called a *τείχος*, nor is there any mention of a *τείχος* on the dam. Then he says, p. 123, *die Karthager leisten aber noch widerstand ἐκ τῆς ἄκρας, dh. von der südspitze des χῶμα aus*. His interpretation here is arbitrary. But as he supposes that the dam ran out towards the wharf, and thus identifies the *τείχος* with the dam and the *ἄκρα* with the wharf, he ought to take *τὴν διὰ μέσου θάλασσαν* for the sea between the wharf and the dam. This would not suit his theory; so he says, p. 123, *es ist der*

meeresteil zwischen der nördlichen unter den beiden punktierten linien bei Falbe und der küste. According to Falbe's map this was some way to the westward. Dr. Meltzer has certainly a curious method of translating; but in dealing with the wharf he never is guided by the natural meaning of the evidence before him. He proceeds on the assumption that the wharf was necessarily on the east side of the harbour-mouth, since the Romans could not otherwise have made an attack upon the northern pond, as required by his theory.

My theory is that the wharf was on the west side of the harbour-mouth, and therefore open to attack by land. I have always admitted that this view would be untenable, if there were evidence to show that the dam ever was completed; for in the naval action described by Appian, viii. 123, the ships must have crossed the line of the dam to reach a wharf between the harbour-mouth and the shore. And here Dr. Meltzer says, p. 54, *Scipios sperrdamm war ja gerade fertig, als das seegefecht stattfand; spät am abend endete es, und gleich am folgenden morgen griff Scipio das χῶμα an, was eben nur von seinem damm aus geschehen konnte*. This is an interesting bit of reasoning. The wharf could not have been on the west side of the harbour-mouth, if the dam was finished when the naval action was fought. It is clear that the dam was finished then; for the Romans attacked the wharf next morning, and they could not have reached the wharf unless the dam was finished. And why not? Because the wharf was on the east side of the harbour-mouth! It is so easy to prove that a thing was not in any given place, if you only start with the assumption that the thing was somewhere else.

In speaking of the wharf, Appian says that it was defended by a *διατείχισμα* or *παρатеύχισμα*, viii. 123–125. Now, on my hypothesis, the wharf ran out from the shore to the harbour-mouth, and had a wall across the landward end to keep the enemy off. Dr. Meltzer has to suppose that the wall was intended to prevent a landing on the wharf—p. 122, *gewis nur an einen landungsversuch gedacht*—in which case it must have run right round the sides that faced the sea; and such a wall could hardly be termed a *παρатеύχισμα* or *διατείχισμα*.

Dr. Meltzer not only asserts that the dam was finished, but that it has never been destroyed—p. 67, *ihn wegzuräumen hat nie jemand anlass gehabt*. And he places its remains between the points marked 41 and

45 on Falbe's map, where I can only see a natural bar across the mouth of a little bay. And then he exclaims, p. 56, *welch enorme länge hätte nun der damm bekommen, welch eigentümliche richtung annehmen müssen, um Torrs hafeneingang zu erreichen*. He does not explain what he means by the *eigentümliche richtung*; and I cannot guess. But the *enorme länge* is no more than is required by the evidence. Appian says that the work was regarded as *χρονίου τε καὶ μακροῦ καὶ ἰσως ἀδυνάτου*, viii. 121. I may note here that Dr. Meltzer wastes a dozen lines on p. 56 in giving some words of mine a meaning that they do not bear. He really might have seen that what I call in English *the promontory of Carthage* is precisely what he calls in German *die Karthagische halbinsel*.

According to my theory, the square part of the Cothon was the southern end and continued the line of fortifications which formed the angle, ἡ γωνία, the round part being the northern end and continuing the curve of the hills. To the south of the citadel the ground is nearly level, with a solitary hillock a little way behind the southern pond; and I suppose that this hillock was selected for the angular point in the fortifications, as the strongest position available. On p. 55 Dr. Meltzer calls this *eine irrige ansicht* of mine. He does not give his reasons there; but he says on p. 53, *aus den berichten der quellen über die letzte belagerung geht unzweideutig hervor, dass die vielgenannte dreifache befestigungslinie, welche die stadt gegen die landseite (landenge) hin deckte, mit ihrem südlichen ende den see von Tunis berührt haben muss*. He therefore places the angular point considerably further to the south; for it formed the south end of the triple wall, and he says that this abutted on the lake of Tunis. But that is clearly a mistake. Appian states that the Romans carried their entrenchments across the promontory ἐκ θαλάσσης ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, viii. 119, and he distinguishes the lake as λίμνη. As these entrenchments ran from sea to sea, they must have passed between the city and the lake; so the fortifications of the city cannot have abutted on the lake. I had to point this out in my reply to Dr. Oehler, p. 377; and Dr. Meltzer returns to the question in his *Nachschrift*, saying, p. 135, *auch die unrichtige anschauung über den zug der sog. dreifachen stadtmauer in ihrem südlichen teile kehrt wieder, jetzt nicht besser als früher gestützt durch eine deutung von Appian, viii. 119 a a., die ja an sich zulässig wäre, wenn es nur auf den landläufigen sinn*

des einzelnen wortes ankäme, sich aber sofort als unmöglich erweist, sobald man den ganzen zusammenhang und die thatsachen in betracht zieht, die in dieser hinsicht schon seit langer zeit vollkommen sichergestellt sind. That is simply a bit of bluster. Its value is shown by what he says elsewhere. Thus, on p. 123, he asserts that Dr. Oehler has set right *ein starkes misverständnis* of mine in relation to the sortie described by Appian, viii. 124. Dr. Oehler's interpretation of the passage may be better than my own; but I fail to see how Dr. Meltzer can accept it. Dr. Oehler maintains that, when the Romans were driven away from the dam, they fled in a panic to their camp on the neck of the promontory. In that case, they must have passed between the city and the lake; and this would have been impossible, if the fortifications of the city had abutted on the lake, as Dr. Meltzer supposes.

Strabo says that the inner harbour at Carthage consisted of a little circular island surrounded by a channel with docks on either side in a ring, xvii. 3. 14. And I imagine that the inner harbour was nearly surrounded by the outer harbour; for Appian says that around the docks there was a double wall, and πύλαι which carried the merchants from the outer harbour into the city without passing through the docks, viii. 96. This statement would be pointless, if πύλαι here meant *gates*; for if the merchants had only to walk through gates to reach the city, there would have been no question of passing through the docks in the inner harbour. I therefore suppose that πύλαι here means *channels*, as in Strabo, iii. 5. 5, quoting Pindar, πύλας Γαδειρίδας, Aeschylos, *Prometheus* 729, στενοπόροις λίμνης πύλαις, and Euripides, *I.A.* 803, ἐν πύλαις, cf. 804, Εὐρίπῳ πέλαις. And I rely on passages in Plato and Diodoros as evidence that such channels did exist at Carthage. In reply to this, Dr. Meltzer says, p. 54, *ferner hat πύλαι an der von Torr dafür angeführten stellen durchaus nicht die bedeutung von 'canälen' wie er sie auch für Appian, viii. 96, annehmen möchte, freilich ohne irgendwie eine klare vorstellung davon zu geben, welche bewandtnis es dann eigentlich mit diesen canälen gehabt haben sollte*. He does not state his grounds for making these assertions. If the objection is that πύλαι must refer to natural waterways, I may cite Diodoros, xiv. 7. 3, where an artificial waterway at Syracuse is termed a πύλη.

Appian says that there were docks for 220 ships in the inner harbour at Carthage, some on the land around and some on the

island, viii. 96. I maintain that, if the Carthaginian docks were of the same dimensions as the Athenian docks of the same date, the inner harbour cannot be represented by the northern pond, as a frontage of at least 5638 feet would be required where no more than 4442 feet would be available. On p. 66 Dr. Meltzer says that this has been disproved by Dr. Oehler. After reading my reply to Dr. Oehler, he returns to the question in his *Nachschrift*, saying, p. 135, *betreffs der schiffshäuser im Peiræus darf vor allem wohl auf C. Wachsmuth, 'die Stadt Athen im Altertum,' II. i. s. 60 ff. (vgl. B. Lupus, 'Syrakus' usw. s. 26. 175) verwiesen werden. ernstlich einspruch zu erheben ist aber gegen den versuch Torrs die sache mit den schmalen schiffshäusern (2.5 m) in Syrakus zu verschieben. hier heisst es einfach den festgestellten thatbestand zum ausgangspunkt der betrachtung nehmen, nicht ihn nach jeweiligem bedarf ändern.* Wachsmuth's book does not contain a single figure in support of Dr. Oehler's calculations. It is true that Wachsmuth mentions the fact that Graser published some rough and ready measurements, which differed widely from those that afterwards were taken by Lieut. von Alten in the Germany survey. But nobody has quoted Graser's measurements since the publication of the *Karten von Attika*. I have dealt with the statements of Lupus in my reply to Dr. Oehler, p. 376. The rest of Dr. Meltzer's remarks exhibit a strange confusion of thought. It is a *thatbestand* that there are certain walls at Syracuse with intervals of 2.5 m between them. It is not a *thatbestand* that each of these intervals represents a dock. That is merely an hypothesis. And I think my own hypothesis is better, since it is justified by the analogy of the docks at Athens. In reply to Dr. Meltzer's statements on p. 66, to the effect that there is a grave discrepancy between Beulé's measurements and mine, I may remark that the only difference is that Beulé's measurements were given in metres and I have put them into English feet.

Certain remains at Utica having been attributed to an excavated harbour with an island in the middle, I argued against that view, and pointed out that there are similar remains at Carthage with an inscription to mark them as the baths. Dr. Meltzer says, p. 55, *Oehler hat die schwächen jener folgerungen meist schon hinreichend aufgedeckt.* Dr. Oehler took three objections, and I dealt with these in my reply to him, p. 375. After reading my reply, Dr. Meltzer says in his *Nachschrift* that he never attached any im-

portance to the story of the anchor—p. 135, *ich habe sie aber nicht einmal erwähnt.* Then only two objections remain. Dr. Meltzer says, p. 55, *endlich sei noch darauf hingewiesen, dass die umgebung der ruine n. 67 (vgl. Tissot, II, s. 799, C.I.L. VIII. n. 12513) keinerlei angemessene unterlage für einen vergleich bietet, wie ihn Torr mit gewissen verhältnissen in Utica ziehen will.* The references serve only to identify the ruins at Carthage as those with the inscription to mark them as the baths. The rest is merely a repetition of Dr. Oehler's first objection—*aus der ähnlichkeit des grundrisses allein ist kein zwingender beweis abzuleiten.* And, as I pointed out before, the resemblance goes far beyond the ground-plan, and shows that both ruins belong to structures of the same design and date. I may remark that I have seen both the ruins, and Drs. Oehler and Meltzer have not seen either of them. Dr. Oehler's second objection—*aber sumpfe können sich doch mit der zeit vergrössern*—was directed against my statement that the marsh at Utica must overlap the former coast-line, as it runs right into the orchestra of the theatre. The objection does not touch this point at all; but it must be fatal to my opponent's case. The current topography of Utica is based on the assumption that the former coast-line is marked by the edge of the marsh; and this assumption is untenable, if the marsh has gradually been increasing. But apart from that assumption, there is nothing to suggest that the sea ever ran into the alleged harbour. Dr. Meltzer only says, p. 55, *schliesslich wird es doch dabei bleiben, dass das, was von jeher als der rest des kriegshafens von Utica betrachtet worden ist, dissen auch wirklich darstellt.* If a question could be settled by assertions, Dr. Meltzer would clearly be the man to settle it; but he does not appear to be quite so well qualified for dealing with evidence.

Cecil Torr.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Neuwied.—At Nieder-Bieber in this neighbourhood, in the course of excavations in the Römer-Kastell, was found a bronze bust of one of the Gordians. The bust is larger than life-size, and a fine piece of work; it will be placed in the Provinzial-Museum at Bonn.¹

ITALY.

Concordia Sagittaria, Venetia. More inscriptions from the tombs of Roman soldiers have recently come to light (cf. *Class. Rev.* for March p. 182). (1) From a stone coffer, of the Antonine period: .NNTVS...

¹ *Athenaeum*, 28th April.

VIRCO...probably referring to one of the gens Ennius, *sevir* or *duovir Concordiae*. (2) ENAV... | VIT IN (fabrica) SAGITTARIA | QUI VIXIT AN...cf. *C.I.L.* v. 8742, *qui militavit in fabrica sagittaria*; probably the Sagittarii Nervii, as in *C.I.L.* v. 8762. (3) Of the time of Constantine, invoking a penalty of so many *folles* (small coin) to be paid to the treasury by any one disturbing the tomb. The others present no special interest.²

Toscanello Immolesse, near Bologna. In a sepulchre of the Villanova type have been found a so-called *tininnabulum*, bell-shaped, ornamented with serpentine patterns, and inlaid with red amber, and a sort of bronze hammer also inlaid with amber, which may have been used for striking the bell. Similar objects have been found before now in Etruscan tombs. With these objects were a bronze handle, two spindle-whorls of vitreous paste, and three boat-shaped fibulae.³

Lepignano, Etruria. A bath has been excavated here, which was constructed to make use of the chalybeate water coming from the hill above. Different methods of construction point to restorations during the third and fourth centuries. It appears to have been finally used as a sort of store-house, as shown by fragments of casks, jars, amphorae, and mill-stones. In the remains were found a life-size marble statue of Diana Venatrix, a head of Venus in Greek marble, and a head of Cybele.⁴

At *Teramo*, Picenum, the ancient *Interamna*, five interesting inscriptions have been found. (1) Q. POPPAEO Q'F' | MVNICE'ET'COLON | PATRONO. He is mentioned in *C.I.L.* ix. 5074, 5076. *Interamna*, as we learn from the stone, was both a *municipium* and a *colonia* (see Weber, *Die Röm. Agrargeschichte*, p. 61). (2) L'FISTANVS L'F'[L] TETTAIVS L'F' BARCHA 'II VIR[IT]TER'IN CAMPVM 'EX' C(onscriptorum) 'D(ecreto) 'P[ro]EQVNIA 'SOCIORVM 'CAMPI 'FACIVNDVM 'COERAVERE 'EIDEMQ' TROBAYERE; on the side of the stone EXTRA MACERIA[N] | IN AGE M... | ... PRECAR...cf. *C.I.L.* ix. 5076. (3) C'F'SILV[ANVS] | BALNEAS RE[FIC]. The nature of his office cannot be ascertained. (4) ..VS'DEDICAT EPVL[A] | SING'DEC' HS'XX'N'SE | V[ir]E'ET'AVG'HS'X'PLE | E[re]I'HS'THIN' DEDIT (see Pannella, *Rivista abruzzese*, ann. viii. fasc. vi. p. 285). (5) HERC'NEL (in archaic letters). *Nel* may be an obscure local title. Cf. *Herulis ponderum*, *C.I.L.* vi. 336. The stone was used as a weight, equivalent to fifty Roman pounds.⁴

Florence.—A well of Roman date has come to light, approached by a flight of steps, with walls of concrete. In one wall was a rectangular niche, lined with marble, perhaps for an image of a river-god. A relief of a river-god has also been found, of Luna marble, probably representing the Arno; the date of the well and relief appears to be about A.D. 200.⁵

Orvieto.—Excavations in tombs have brought to light some good specimens of bronzes and Greek pottery, among the former being a cottabos-stand on three lion's feet, surmounted by a nude figure, and several *simpula*, one with dogs' heads on the handles and a relief of a nude man running. Among the vases are a b.f. lekythos with two warriors in combat, and a r.f. stamnos representing Triptolemos in his winged car and other figures; also a r.f. kylix inscribed *ὁ παῖς καλός* (int. a youth on horseback; ext. scene from palaestra), anciently repaired.³

Capannori, Etruria. In an Etruscan tomb a large jar has been discovered containing a crater, in which were twenty-four gold objects and fragments of burnt bones. The crater has r.f. designs, on one side Theseus slaying the Minotaur, on the other apparently the same hero and Skiron (or perhaps an adventure of Herakles); it is in very bad condition. The gold ornaments consist of a pair of earrings, numerous fragments of a chain, eleven fibulae, and a pin. With the vase, they appear to date about the beginning of the fifth century B.C. The chain is made up of figures of Sirens and other objects.⁵

Corneto-Tarquini.—Further excavations in the necropolis have brought to light a vaulted tomb with remains of pottery much incrustated and in bad condition. They include three proto-Corinthian lekythoi, a Corinthian aryballos, and a kantharos of bucheo ware; also a green paste scaraboid with an archaic human face on the back, and two running figures on the flat side. Other tombs contained remains of the third century B.C., but nothing of importance beyond a kylix of Italian fabric with a female head in profile. From another tomb of the end of the sixth century came a b.f. kylix, two gold earrings, and a carnelian scarab; on either side of the kylix is a galloping Centaur. Two other tombs contained an aryballos of Egyptian porcelain and gold ornaments, and early pottery (including a Corintho-Attic lekythos) respectively.²

Naples.—Remains of a building of Roman times have been discovered, consisting of walls of unburnt brick, with a *suspensura* supported by tiles resting on terra-cotta pillars, and perforated with tubes; it was much blackened on the under side, and was evidently the floor of a *calidarium*, probably of a public bath. Two marble bases have been found supporting the pilasters of an archway, both bearing inscriptions; also two other inscribed slabs of marble. The inscription on one of the bases is of thirteen lines, and gives the dedication to Nicomachus Flavianus of the statue which the base formerly supported. He is styled, *consularis Campaniae, proconsul Asiae, praefectus urbi iterum, patronus originalis*, and appears to have lived about A.D. 400. Part of the inscription seems to relate to another person. Remains of a subterranean chamber, apparently a Roman tomb, have been found, with vestibule and passages; the tomb contained part of an Aretine bowl, with figures of a woman and an old man, and glass bottles.^{2, 6}

Altavilla Silentina, Lucania.—An interesting tomb has been discovered with paintings on the walls. On one side are represented two warriors in the local Messapian costume, in the act of combat; behind stands a draped female figure, holding a hydria on her head, and recalling the *hydrophoroi* of the Parthenon frieze. On the opposite wall is a quadriga guided by a winged Nike, and a column representing a *meta*. On the third side, a lion and ibis confronted; above, a cock between a bunch of grapes and a pomegranate. On the fourth side are traces of an armed horseman to whom a female figure holds out a patera. The paintings appear to belong to the third century B.C. In this tomb were found a lekythos with a female head, and a two-handled vase with a youth and a seated female figure.⁵

Syracuse.—At the beginning of last summer Dr. Orsi resumed his excavations in the large Greek necropolis known as Del Fusco; they are now completed, and a report of the results published. The

² *Notizie dei Lincei*, Dec. 1893.

³ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Aug. 1893.

⁴ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Sept. 1893.

⁵ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Oct. 1893.

⁶ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Nov. 1893.

tombs are all of the archaic period, dating from about 800 B.C. down to the fifth century; they have suffered very much from robberies at different times. There are about 120 in all, mostly mere trenches scooped out of the tufa, but some in the form of sarcophagi with or without covers, others with coverings of tiles, and a few, large jars or *ossuaria*; nearly all the corpses had been buried. The majority of the finds were of Greek pottery, including numerous proto-Corinthian vases, specimens of b.f. vases by 'minor artists,' and a few r.f. The following tombs contained the most interesting examples: (No. 16) two r.f. lekythi, one with Eos, in bad condition. (19) A large archaic stamnos in fragments, with palmette-patterns on the shoulders. (20) A large model of a biga, (24) five buchero kantharoi, (28) twenty-four large bent nails of bronze, and (29) a small proto-Corinthian lekythos with friezes of animals. (41) A b.f. kylix by a minor artist, with unintelligible inscription, (54) a r.f. skyphos of fine style, with 'mantle-figures,' and (65) an amphora imitative of Rhodian or Melian style, with geometrical patterns, a pyxis, and a b.f. kylix. (74) Numerous fragments of b.f. vases: two late kylikes and two large skyphoi, fragments of Panathenaic amphorae, and of a crater in the style of Nikosthenes; fragments of b.f. kylikes in the style of Glaukytes, and another in the style of Epiktetos. (85) A vase terminating in an animal's head, and several proto-Corinthian lekythi, one like that in the British Museum, with two friezes and elaborate patterns; also an alabastron of enamelled ware, with figures of animals. (101) An early Corinthian kylix and stamnos, an early pyxis and lekythos, the latter with three dogs running. (113) Two proto-Corinthian lekythi with dogs and lions, and (115) a b.f. phiale omphalotos with ten 'mantle-figures.' Scattered about were a lekythos with Dionysiac subjects; an olpè with Artemis carrying a stag, attended by a panther, in the style of Pamphaios; an oinochoe with Dionysos, Apollo, and Artemis; an ivory counter with an archaic Artemis carrying a stag; boat-shaped and serpent-shaped fibulae; rings of various kinds, three glazed scarabs, and two iron knives.⁶

Sardinia.—At Terranova Fausania a sepulchre has been excavated containing three Roman tombs on each side, and the following objects: a glass bottle and a lamp stamped LVPATI; sixteen coins of Probus and Carinus; a bi-uncial *as* with Janus and ship's prow, inscribed ROMA; and a lamp with palm and crown. In the neighbourhood were found thirteen lamps, five stamped. Altogether 700 tombs have been excavated in this neighbourhood, containing 350 fragments of pottery, over 2,000 coins, 125 glass bottles, and other unimportant remains. Fragments of a mosaic pavement have also been found, belonging to a fountain, with part of an old Roman aqueduct.⁷

GREECE.

Athens.—Dörpfeld has discovered the site of the temple of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις, together with statues, reliefs, and inscriptions relating to the worship and rites, and the ceremonies attending initiation into the sacred society of the Ἰόβανχοι. The chief find was a large altar with sacrificial scenes: (1) a man preparing to slay a goat, and an ox tied by the horns to an altar; (2) a Satyr dragging a ram by the horns, and a man about to fell it with a club; (3) Dionysos, Pan, and a Satyr; (4) an inscription. The *Ἐρεάκπουρος* is now finally identified, and the remains of buildings discovered near it may well be the Odeion. All the finds belong to the second and third centuries of our era, except a head of King Attalos. One

inscription gives the name of a new archon eponymos, Epaphroditos.⁷

Delphi.—The Paean to Apollo discovered in the treasury of the Athenians has been published by Dr. Weil; it is not earlier than 300 B.C., and contains several ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς λεγόμενα. The hymns with musical notes inscribed on slabs have now been published in the *Bull. de Corr. Hell.* (1893, pt. 4); there are six in all, but only two are of any length. They are written in the Paeanic measure, but the rhythmical periods are not easy to make out. The mention of the Γαλαταὶ lends an air of probability to the conjecture that the hymn was composed a few years after the attack of the Gauls on Phocis in 278 B.C. Probably there was in Delphi an Attic *θεοφία* for celebrating the miraculous preservation of the holy place and of all Greece.⁸

Livadia.—The cave of Trophonios is conjectured to have been discovered in this neighbourhood, in a grotto-like crypt under a church built on the hill to the north of Livadia. The nature of the place and its mysterious character tally with the account given by Pausanias (ix. 39, 10).⁹

Crete.—Mr. Arthur Evans has made some interesting discoveries in the central part of the island. He has come upon the sites of two hitherto unknown prehistoric cities, one with acropolis and votive grotto containing statuettes of a Mycenaean type, the other with stupendous ruins, perhaps of what was once the principal centre of the Mycenaean civilization, and acropolis and remains of a palace. He also claims to have discovered traces of a Mycenaean system of writing, which seems closely parallel with the Hittite and picture-writing systems. Another system has been discovered, apparently alphabetic, approaching more nearly to the Cypriote syllabary, the objected being reduced to linear forms.⁹

AFRICA.

Malacoteland.—Eight coins, in a fair state of preservation, have been found in the neighbourhood of the ruins at Zimbabye. They are undoubtedly Roman; four are inscribed CONSTANTIVS CAES., another HELENA AVGVSTA, and one represents the wolf suckling Romulus and Remus.¹⁰

H. B. WALTERS.

Revue Archéologique. July—August. 1893.

2. Espérandieu: list of Roman oculists' stamps, continued. 3. S. Reinach: discusses the terminology of megalithic monuments. 3. Kont: a lengthy analysis of the position of Lessing as an archaeologist. 4. Vercoûtre: identifies the subject of relief on the bronze mirror of Bulla regia as an episode in the Nausikaa legend. 5. de la Blanchère: new readings of three inscriptions in the Oran Museum. 6. Mayor: notes on the Merovingian rings of the Geneva Museum. Obituary, Julien Havet.

The same. September—October. 1893.

1. Deloche: Merovingian seals and rings, continued. 2. de Vogüé: publishes a vase in form of a bird found at Carthage. 3. Espérandieu: list of Roman oculists' stamps, continued. 4. Kont: Lessing as archaeologist, continued.

Review of Lanckoronski's *Pamphylia*, by Radet. S. Reinach's *Chronique d'Orient*, pp. 221—266.

⁷ *Athenaeum*, 24 March.

⁸ *Athenaeum*, 5 May.

⁹ *Academy*, 5 May.

¹⁰ *Standard*, 8 May.

Plate xix. (p. 270) gives a statue of a warrior recently found near Vachères (Basses-Alpes) and now in the Musée Calvet of Avignon: M. Saguier thinks it is either the Emperor Magnentius or his brother, Caesar Decentius.

The same. November—December. 1893.

1. Le Blant: publishes a series of terra-cotta panels found in Tunis in the ruins of a basilica S.W. of Kairwan: they represent biblical subjects. 2. Joulin: proposes to substitute Κόμρ for Πόμρ in Strabo xiii. 41. 3. Espérandieu: list of Roman oculists' stamps, continued.

8. Reinach, *Chronique d'Orient*, part ii. pp. 339—386. Obituary, Ingwald Undset. Cagnat, *Revue des publications Epigraphiques*.

Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική. 1893. part iv.

1. Nicolaides: on Kallirrhoe and the Ennea-

krounos: disputes Dörpfeld's identification of the Enneakrounos and the temple of Demeter: with a disquisition on the Bunarbashi-Hissarlik-Troy question. 2. Cavvadias: publishes (pl. 12—13) a bronze statuette of Zeus Ammon perhaps from Alexandria: the type is that of a bearded draped human bust, with ram's horns, terminating in the body and head of a snake. 3. Mayer: publishes (pl. 14) fragments of a pedimental composition from Eleusis, representing Pluto carrying off Persephone, in the presence of Athene, Artemis, Hermes, and Hekate. 4. Leper: a fragment of a catalogue of prytaneis. 5. Mylonas: publishes (pl. 15) a folding mirror from Eretria: on the one side is a relief representing Aphrodite on a swan: on the other, a woman, probably Selene, riding on a horse. 6. The same: thirty-three sepulchral inscriptions.

C. S.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie u. Pädagogik. Ed. Fleckeisen u. Richter (Leipzig: Teubner).

1893. Heft 10 contains (1) C. Schirlitz *Die Reihenfolge der fünf ersten reden in Platons Symposion*. (2) H. Stadtmüller *Zur Griech. Anthologie*, textual criticisms and other notes. (3) E. Hasso *Ueber den dualis bei Lukianos*, a collection of instances showing that Lucian followed the Attic usage. (4) C. Krauth *Verschollene lünder des alterthums* (see next number). (5) G. Hubo *Die ausdehnung des gebietes der Helvetier*. (6) M. Kiderlin *Altes u. neues zu Quintilianus i.—iii.*, critical notes.

Heft 11 contains (1) C. Schirlitz *Die fünf ersten reden in Plat. Symposion* (conclusion). (2) F. Hultsch *Zur Sylaxis des Ptolemaios*, chiefly on the late Greek for ordinal numbers, such as ἑβδομηκοντομόνος for seventy-first. (3) C. Krauth *Verschollene lünder des alterthums*, contending that the ancient Tanais was the river now called the Manich (flowing into the sea of Azov) and that an eastern branch of this river, flowing into the Caspian, was called by Aristotle Araxes, by Alexander Oresartes, by the Romans Jaxartes. This was the Araxes of the Massagetae, about which Herodotus (i. 202—204) has created so much confusion. (4) H. Lewy *Zu Hesychios*, emendations. (5) F. Wilhelm *Zu Tibullus iii. 6*, assigning the poem to Lygdamus and praising it. The number concludes with several isolated emendations, the best of which is one of P. Hennings, who proposes *sublentescit* for *splendescit* in Cic. *de Senect.* 28.

Heft 12 contains (1) F. Mie *Zum fünfkampf der Griechen*, a full discussion, of which the chief novelty appears to be the suggestion that the last two contests of the pentathlon did not take place if one competitor won the first three. (2) F. Susenmühl *Zu Arist. Politik*, explaining certain alterations of the text in his third edition. (3) F. Skutsch and F. Vollmer *Ad Statii Silvas*, textual criticisms. (4) F. Philippi *Zur Paulinischen tafel*, continued. (5) Th. Opitz *Der Trierer Sallusthandschrift*, showing that the MS. agrees usually with *m*, of the second class.

1894. Heft 1 contains (1) O. Froehde *Litteratur-Kunst- u. Sprachwissenschaft*. (2) R. Peppmüller *Griechische bittlieder*, such as the swallow-song. (3) W. Christ *Das Griechische theater*, a summary of recent discoveries and theories, showing how they have affected the meaning to be attributed to such words as *θεμέλη*, *δρχήστρα* κ.τ.λ. (4) O. Meltzer *Die häfen von Karthago*, first part. Several brief articles of no moment follow.

Heft 2 contains (1) H. Kluge *Der Schild des Achilleus*, illustrating it from objects found at

Mycenae, and contending that the scenes were engraved. (2) F. Susenmühl *Zur Alexandrinischen litteraturgesch.* I. on Aratus and the Stoics, II. on Theocr. *Idyll.* 4. (3) R. Fruin *Zur Fustenkritik*, a discussion of five difficulties, such as 'the interreges of the first two centuries of the republic.' (4) O. Meltzer *Die häfen von Karthago*, conclusion. (5) R. Fuchs *Wundermittel aus der Zeit des Galenos*, an amusing article containing a list of strange remedies (such as 'dirt scraped off the statues in the palaestra') recommended by Galen.

Heft 3 contains (1) H. Düntzer on Πηλέος bei Homeros, contending that the word is often scanned as a spondee. (2) W. Christ *Zur Chronologie Attischer dramen*, contending that actors and chorus, in the classical drama, were on a stage raised above the *παροδοί*. (3) F. Hultsch *Zu dem Komiker Krates*, on a coin called *ἡλεκτρον* named by Krates and Pollux as worth 8 obols. (4) W. Schwarz *Zur politik Alexanders des grossen*, complaining of Grote's depreciation of A. (5) H. Magnus *Zur Kritik der Metam. Ovids*, on the O-family of MSS. (6) L. Gurlitt *Ciceros briefschaften u. ihre verbreitung unter Augustus*, contending against the theory that the Tironian edition of Cic.'s letters was published so late as A.D. 60.

Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione classica.

Ed. Comparetti and Müller (Torino: Loescher).

1893. Fasc. 10—12. The only original article is a continuation of L. Valmaggia's monograph on *La fortuna di Stazio nella tradizione letteraria latina e basso latina*. Several reviews are included.

Anno xxii. Fasc. 1—3 contain (1) G. Turiello *Sui composti sintattici nelle lingue classiche*, continued. (2) O. Nazari *Quo anno Aristophanes natus sit*, contending for 446 B.C. (3) E. Filippini *Delle fonti adibite da Plutarco nella esposizione della guerra Gallica di Cesare*, contending that P. used, besides Caesar himself, Valerius Maximus, Oppius, Tanusius and Asinius Pollio. (4) G. Setti *Studi critici sulla Anth. Pal.* (5) F. Scerbo *La riforma ortografica Latina*, a summary of certain reforms admitted to be correct, with a warning against excessive deference to inscriptions, inasmuch as the same word is often spelt in different ways on the same inscription. (6) F. Nencini *Quaestiones Terentianae alterae*, notes and emendations.

Fasc. 4—6 contain (1) A. de Angeli *La musica nel drama greco*, apparently a lecture, containing no novelties. (2) A. G. Amateucci *Appio Claudio Cieco*, another lecture. (3) G. Setti *Studi critici sulla Anth. Pal.*

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Persae. By Rev. T. S. Ramsbotham. 12mo. (Scenes from Greek Plays). Longman. 1s. 6d.
- Allcroft* (A. H.) *The Decline of Hellas: a history of Greece*. 37s. 323 B.C. Post 8vo. 184 pp. Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Aristophanes*. Wasps. By C. E. Graves. 12mo. 234 pp. Cambridge Press. 3s. 6d.
- Caesar*. Gallic War. Book VII. Edited by A. H. Allcroft and W. F. Masom. Post 8vo. 186 pp. Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Dupré* (A. M. D.) *First Exercises on Latin Construction*. Crown 8vo. Limp. Kelfe. 1s.
- Euripides* in English Verse, Arthur S. Way. Vol. I. Crown 8vo. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- Herodotus*. Marathon and Thermopylae. Easy selections from, edited by A. C. Liddell. 18mo. Limp. Methuen. 1s. 6d.
- Holden* (F. T.) *Triperita*. 4th Series. A course of Easy Latin Exercises for Preparatory Schools, arranged to suit the threefold division of the year. 12mo. 124 pp. Longman. 2s.
- Homer's Iliad*. Book XXIV. Edited with notes, introduction, and vocabulary, by Walter Leaf and M. A. Bayfield. 12mo. 126 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Infamia: its Place in Roman Public and Private Law*, by A. H. J. Greenidge. Demy 8vo. Clarendon Press. 10s. 6d.
- Juvenal Satires I.—VIII.* (Expurgated). A translation, with test papers, by A. H. Allcroft. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Latin Prose Versions*. Contributed by various scholars, edited by G. G. Ramsay. 4to. Hali Vellum. Clarendon Press. 21s. net.
- Latine Vertenda*. English Sentences to be turned into Latin, for Junior Forms. 18mo. 136 pp. Simpkin. 1s. 6d. net.
- Quintus Curtius*: Selections adapted for the use of beginners, with vocabulary, notes and exercises, edited by F. Coverley Smith. 18mo. 140 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Ritchie* (F.) *A First Latin Verse Book*. 12mo. 64 pp. Longman. 2s.
- Smith* (Sir W.) *A Classical Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, Mythology and Geography*, revised throughout and in part rewritten by G. E. Marindin. With numerous maps and illustrations. 8vo. 1020 pp. Murray. 18s.
- Sophocles*. *Oedipus at Colonus*. Closely translated from the Greek, an experiment in metre, by Arthur Compton Auchmuty. Post 8vo. 80 pp. Simpkin. 2s.
- *Plays and Fragments, with critical notes, commentary and translation in English prose*. Part VI. *The Electra*. 8vo. 324 pp. Cambridge Press. 12s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Alciphron*. Reich (H.) *De Alciphronis Longique aetate*. Diss. 8vo. 68 pp. Königsberg. 1 Mk. 20 Pf.
- Apollonius Rhodius*. Berekmann (F.) *De scholiis in Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica Etymologici magni fonte*. Diss. 8vo. 42 pp. Bonn.
- Bérard* (V.) *De arbitrio inter liberas graecorum civitates*. (Thèse). 8vo. ii, 124 pp. Paris, Thorin.
- *Essai de méthode en mythologie grecque. De l'origine des cultes arcadiens*. (Thèse). 8vo. 385 pp. Paris, Thorin.
- Caesaris* (C. Julii) *belli gallici libri vii*. A. Hirtii liber viii. Recensuit, apparatu critico instruxit Henr. Meusel. 8vo. xii, 261 pp. Map. Berlin, Weber. 3 Mk.
- *Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von H. Meusel. Mit einem Anhang: Das römische Kriegswesen zu Caesars Zeit von R. Schneider*. 8vo. xv, 238 pp. Map. Berlin, Weber. Boards. 1 Mk. 25 Pf.
- Cagnat* (R.) *L'année épigraphique, revue des publications épigraphiques relatives à l'antiquité classique* (1893). 8vo. Paris, Leroux. 3 Fr.
- Cassiodori Senatoris variae, recensuit Th. Mommsen*. Accedunt I. *Epistulae Theodoricianae variae* edidit Th. Mommsen. II. *Acta synhodorum habiturum Romae a. CCCCXCVIII*. DI. edidit Th. Mommsen. III. *Cassiodori orationum reliquiae* edidit Lud. Traube. 4to. clxxxiv, 597 pp. 2 photolithographic plates. 28 Mk. Writing Paper. 42 Mk.
- [*Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auctorum antiquissimorum tom. XII*. Berlin, Weidmann.]
- Catullus*. Ballin (F.) *Das amöbaische Hochzeitslied des Catull*. Progr. 4to. 39 pp. Dessau.
- *Morgenstern* (O.) *Curae Catullianae*. Progr. 4to. 20 pp. Gr.-Lichterfelde.
- Choix d'Eschyle. De Sophocle et d'Euripide*. Notice, analyse et extraits par Deltour et Rinn. 12mo. 108 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Cicero*. *Plaidoyer pour Murena, expliqué littéralement, traduit en français et annoté par J. Thibault*. 12mo. 200 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 Fr. 50.
- *Buning* (G.) *Zu Ciceros Briefen. I. Die beiden Gesetze des Publius Clodius gegen Marcus Tullius Cicero*. Progr. 4to. 23 pp. Coesfeld.
- Cleomedes*. Steinbrück (K.) *De Cleomedis cosmographiae codice quodam Parisino*. Diss. 8vo. 47 pp. Greifswald.
- Collection Barracco* (La.) *Publiée par Fred. Bruckmann, d'après la classification et avec le texte de Giovanni Barracco et W. Helbig. Livraisons 11 et 12* (Fin.). Folio. With 20 phototypographical plates and text from pages 55 to 62. München, Verlagsanstalt für Kunst und Wissenschaft. 40 Mk. The complete work, 240 Mk.
- Comédie Latine* (La.) *Extraits de Plaute et de Terence*. Notice et analyse par V. Schneegans. 12mo. 142 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Euripides*. Stettner (E.) *Theodor Bertholds Athetesen im Hippolytos des Euripides, Vers 500—1000*. Progr. 8vo. 26 pp. Triest.
- Eller* (A.) *De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine commentatio. VI. (De Justinian monarchia et Aristobulo Judaeo II.)* Progr. 4to. 15 pp. Bonn.